R. Gridley

# THE GOSPEL
# ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE

# THE GOSPEL
# ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE

## THE GREEK TEXT
WITH
## INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND INDICES

BY

JOHN MARTIN CREED, B.D.

ELY PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE,
FORMERLY FELLOW OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

LONDON
MACMILLAN & CO LTD
NEW YORK · ST MARTIN'S PRESS
1957

*This book is copyright in all countries which*
*are signatories to the Berne Convention*

*First Edition* 1930
*Reprinted* 1942, 1950, 1953, 1957

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY LIMITED
*London Bombay Calcutta Madras Melbourne*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED
*Toronto*

ST MARTIN'S PRESS INC
*New York*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

TO

MY FATHER

# PREFACE

The study of the Gospels appears to have entered upon a new phase. The ' source criticism ' which proved so fruitful in the last century has perhaps little more to teach us. The more recent work is rather concerned with the attempt to grasp the needs and circumstances which, in the first generation, brought about the translation of the memories and impressions of the first believers into literary forms of narrative and discourse, and, in the second, consolidated the traditional material into the finished type ot Gospel. Although I have not infrequently had occasion to criticise and to reject the conclusions of Rudolf Bultmann and of Karl Ludwig Schmidt, I am conscious that these scholars have influenced me not a little. But the critic to whom I owe most is Julius Wellhausen. In his brief and pregnant commentaries and in the accompanying volume of Introduction are to be found the seeds of most of the more important developments of recent years. Besides the works of the scholars whom I have just named, the commentaries of Klostermann, Johannes Weiss, Loisy, Montefiore, as well as Canon Streeter's *The Four Gospels* and Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*, have been constantly at hand.

I have devoted more space than is customary in an Introduction to the history of the interpretation. It is certainly interesting and, I think, important to place the study of the Gospels as it is to-day against the background of the long history from which it has emerged. The Marcan sections of the Gospel have been more briefly treated than the rest; I have as a rule not done much more in these parts of the Gospel than call attention to Luke's treatment of the Marcan source. It did not seem worth while to do again in a commentary on St. Luke what has recently been well done by Dr. Rawlinson in a commentary on St. Mark.

Some personal obligations call for especial mention. To the late Professor H. B. Swete I owe it that I was entrusted with this work. Although he was no longer alive when I began seriously to work on the Gospel, his advice and encouragement at the first undertaking have always been gratefully remembered. I have repeatedly resorted to Professor Burkitt, and I am indebted to him for many suggestions and much wise counsel. Mr. A. D. Nock has drawn my attention to articles in periodicals, which otherwise would have escaped me. In the laborious tasks of correcting proofs and verifying references I have received great help from my wife and from my father. Lastly, I wish to pay a tribute to the accuracy, scholarship, and efficiency of Messrs. R. & R. Clark's readers and workmen.

J. M. C.

Ely,
*January* 1930.

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION—

PAGE

- I. The Book, its Author, and its Date . . . . . xi
- II. History of the Gospel and of its Interpretation—
  - (i.) The Gospel in the Second Century . . . . xxv
  - (ii.) The Age of the Fathers . . . . . . xxxii
  - (iii.) From the Sixth Century to the End of the Middle Age xxxvii
  - (iv.) From the Renaissance to the Rise of Historical Criticism xl
  - (v.) From the Rise of the Critical Study of the Gospels . . xliv
- III. The Composition and the Sources of St. Luke's Gospel . . lvi
- IV. Theological Ideas . . . . . . . . lxxi
- V. Language, Style, and Vocabulary . . . . . . lxxvi
- VI. Text . . . . . . . . . . . lxxxv

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . lxxxvii

ABBREVIATIONS . . . . . . . . . . xc

TEXT AND COMMENTARY . . . . . . . . 1

ADDITIONAL NOTES—

- Magnificat and Benedictus . . . . . . . 303
- Lysanias, Tetrarch of Abilene . . . . . . . 307
- The Baptism of John . . . . . . . . 309
- The Appearance of the Risen Jesus to the Disciples . . . 314
- St. Luke and St. John . . . . . . . . 318

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS . . . . . . . . 323

INDEX OF WRITERS AND WRITINGS . . . . . . 335

INDEX OF SUBJECTS . . . . . . . . . 339

# INTRODUCTION

## I

## THE BOOK, ITS AUTHOR, AND ITS DATE

### The Book

The Gospel according to St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles form two parts of a single historical work. The former gives an account of the birth, life, death, and exaltation of Jesus Christ; the latter traces the expansion of the Christian faith from its Palestinian home to the chief centres of the Graeco-Roman world, and culminates in the preaching of the Gospel at Rome by Paul. The author in his preface (Luke i. 1-4), which is probably intended to cover the entire work and not the Gospel alone, states it as his purpose to write an *orderly* narrative (*καθεξῆς γράψαι*) of what has been brought to fulfilment within the Christian body to which he belongs. The *order* which the writer intends is probably to be understood as chronological and historical order. The Book of Acts is a sequel to the Gospel, and both Gospel and Acts fall internally into consecutive divisions. But it is only with considerable reserves that the Acts can be regarded as a continuation of the Gospel. The Gospel is a unity in itself. It is more than the first part of a continuous story, for the rejection of Jesus the Christ by the Jews and his vindication by God as Lord and Saviour, which are recorded in the Gospel, provide the very content of the preaching whose expansion throughout the world is recorded in the second book. To the evangelist, as to all Christians, the death and resurrection of Jesus made an end and a beginning. The *ἀνάλημψις* of Jesus divides and unites the two books, which are not only consecutive but also interdependent.[1] The interpretation of either part must take account of the theme of the other. The Gospel was the first to be written; but when it was written, the author must have been already acquainted with the general course of events which he relates in Acts, and many distinctive features of the Gospel find their true setting in the completed whole. The evangelist looks back upon the Gospel history across the events which he is to relate in the Acts of the Apostles. So also in the Acts of the Apostles the Gospel narrative is presupposed. True it is but seldom referred to, but the Christ whom, in the Acts, the Jews reject and the Gentiles accept is the same person as he whose preaching and healing are related in the Gospel, and we are intended throughout to bear in mind "the Kingdom of God and the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts xxviii. 31).

---

[1] This relation between the two parts of Luke's work perhaps points the way to the explanation of the literary awkwardness of the introduction to Acts. Norden (*Agnostos Theos*, pp. 313 f.) and Meyer (*Ursprung u. Anfänge*, i. pp. 34 f.), approaching Acts with classical models in their minds, stumble at the incomplete preface of Acts and conjecture that the narrative of the Ascension is an interpolation which has displaced a δέ clause answering to the *τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον* of *v.* 1. Without doubt the preface of Luke i. 1-4 and the partial preface of Acts i. 1 are to be classified with the customary prefaces of contemporary writers; and if Luke had carried through consistently the rôle of a Greek man of letters, he would have completed Acts i. 1 with an outline of the contents of the next volume. But Luke was first a Christian, and he writes history as a theologian and a believer. The conventional preface would have obscured the relation of the story of the words and works of Jesus to the story of the spread of the Gospel. Norden makes the following conjectural completion of the preface to Acts: *νυνὶ δὲ τὰ συνεχῆ τούτοις, ἅ τε αὐτὸς παρὼν εἶδον, ἅ τε παρ' ἄλλων ἀξιοπίστων ὄντων ἐπυθόμην, συγγράψαι πειράσομαι μέχρι τῆς ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥωμῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ Παύλου.* This would be excellent if Luke had thought of the events from the beginning of the Gospel to the end of Acts as a continuous historical series, as Diodorus Siculus regarded the history of the world. But in Luke's view Acts does not simply resume the thread of an interrupted narrative. The true relation of the expansion of the Church to Jesus and his history is admirably brought out by the story of the Ascension. This story is very awkwardly tacked on to the opening sentence, and the awkwardness has perhaps been increased by some textual corruption. But the real source of the awkwardness lies in a certain incongruity between Luke's literary models and the theme with which he has to deal. The charge of Jesus to the apostles provides the substance of the missing δέ clause: this book is to tell how the chosen apostles were witnesses to Jesus in Jerusalem, Judaea, Samaria, and to the end of the earth. It is true that the eleven apostles play very little part in the story that follows, but to Luke they are ideal and representative figures, who link together the company which was with Jesus on earth and the society which still looked for him to return from heaven. Luke's history of the Church is theologically conceived, with the *ἀνάλημψις* of Jesus in the past and his *παρουσία* in the future as the determining factors.

### THE AUTHOR

The authorship of this historical work is ascribed by tradition to the Luke who is described in the Epistle to the Colossians[1] as 'the beloved physician,' and is there found as a companion of St. Paul in his imprisonment. It may be inferred from Col. iv. 11 that Luke the physician was of Gentile birth. According to 2 Tim. iv. 10 Luke was Paul's only companion who remained with him to the end.

The earliest writer who definitely names Luke as the author of the two books *Ad Theophilum* is Irenaeus (*c.* A.D. 185).[2] But it is probable that the attribution was familiar to Justin in the middle of the second century. Without mentioning names of authors, Justin frequently refers to the Memoirs (Ἀπομνημονεύματα) of the Apostles as authorities for the life and teaching of Christ, and examination of his citations shews him to have used with especial frequency the first and third of the canonical Gospels. In *Dial.* 103. 19 he says that the Memoirs were composed "by apostles and by those who followed them." There is every probability that by "those who followed the apostles" he meant Mark and Luke, and that he, like Irenaeus, regarded them as the disciples respectively of Peter and Paul.

There is a presumption that the tradition is true. 'Luke the physician' is not personally a prominent figure in the apostolic age, and, so far as we know, he was not prominent in early tradition. If the Gospel and Acts did not already pass under his name there is no obvious reason why tradition should have associated them with him.[3] He was not an apostle. There are certain difficulties in accepting the tradition, which will be noted presently, but there is a very general agreement among scholars that the tradition either speaks truth or else is founded on truth. If the Lucan authorship of the existing work is called in question, it is generally held that the existing work incorporates some original writing by Luke.

---

[1] Col. iv. 14; cf. also Philem. 24.

[2] *Adv. Haeres.* iii. 1. 2.

[3] Prof. Cadbury (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. ii. pp. 260 f.; *Making of Luke-Acts*, pp. 351 f.) thinks that the ascription of these writings to Luke may be regarded as a critical guess of the later second century,

*Prima facie* the Acts of the Apostles gives us important information about its author. At xvi. 10 the narrative of St. Paul's first journey into Europe abruptly changes from the third person to the first person plural. The natural interpretation of this sudden change is that the author of the book himself joined the Apostle at this point.[1] The first person is discontinued after the arrival

---

based on a combination of *data* in the books of the New Testament, and that at an earlier period the third Gospel and Acts had circulated anonymously. But the Lucan writings are literary works with an individual character of their own and an individual dedication. It is *a priori* probable that such a book was published under its author's name. Another objection to Dr. Cadbury's hypothesis is that the *data* which he suggests may have led to the inference, though compatible with the theory of Lucan authorship in the second century as they are in the twentieth, are not of themselves enough to compel or even directly to suggest it. Dr. Cadbury tabulates the *data* as follows (*Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 355):

(1) Both volumes are addressed to Theophilus and have the same author.

(2) The 'we' passages are understood to imply that the author was an eye-witness of what is related in these parts of Acts, and these include the two years at Rome with which the volume closes.

(3) Since 'we' is not used in the Gospel, identification of the author with an apostle was, in spite of all tendency in that direction, excluded.

(4) According to 2 Tim. iv. 11 (believed by the ancients to be a genuine letter from Paul in prison) Luke was at one time the only Christian companion with Paul.

The necessary foundation for a critical conclusion identifying the *auctor ad Theophilum* with Luke is here lacking, for the 'we' passages do not warrant the conclusion that the *auctor ad Theophilum* was with Paul to the end. The last 'we' occurs in Acts xxviii. 16 (the arrival in Rome), and Paul's end is not narrated. Apart from an existing tradition of Lucan authorship, these *data* would not have established the conclusion which was actually reached.

[1] Windisch (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 329) finds the sudden appearance and disappearance of the 'we' "a rather astonishing characteristic." But if one who had been a companion of Paul during a part of his career, without himself taking a prominent part in the events, were at a later date to undertake the task of writing a history, it seems very natural, as Windisch himself appears to allow on p. 314, that he should thus unobtrusively indicate his presence. Windisch thinks it "much easier to explain the facts as we have them, if we assume that the author of Acts on this occasion took

at Philippi (Acts xvi. 7). It is resumed again abruptly at xx. 5 when Paul again passes through Philippi on his last journey to Jerusalem. From this point it continues until the Apostle reaches Jerusalem (xxi. 17). It is not found in the subsequent narratives of Paul's arrest, trials, and imprisonment, but it reappears once more with the account of the voyage to Rome, and is used for the last time in xxviii. 16 of the arrival of the Apostle and his escort in Rome.

The *prima facie* interpretation of this evidence, viz. that the man who speaks in the first person in these sections is also the author of the book, is confirmed by linguistic evidence. The searching examinations of the 'we' sections by Hawkins [1] and Harnack [2] shew them to be marked throughout by the style and vocabulary characteristic of the author of the third Gospel and the Acts. If the author was here using the diary of some other person, we must suppose him to have re-written it throughout in his own style. This hypothesis makes it difficult to account for the retention of the first person plural.

The reasons which lead many scholars to question the Lucan authorship of Luke-Acts arise almost exclusively from the historical difficulties of the narrative of Acts. For a full discussion of these difficulties reference may be made to Windisch's learned chapter, 'The Case against the Tradition,' in vol. ii. of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. It must suffice here to indicate the chief problems.

The main issue centres upon the account of the apostolic Council in Acts xv. This narrative does not agree in important points with what we ought probably to regard as an account of the same

---

over Luke's diary and copied a passage out of it; and perhaps for literary reasons, or possibly through mere carelessness, failed to mention the name of the travelling companion, who appeared here for the first time." Yet it is clear that the author of Luke-Acts was a skilful and, in his own way, a careful writer. Windisch ascribes to him a clumsiness which seems out of keeping with his character as a writer. There are difficulties involved in the acceptance of the Lucan authorship, but the 'we' sections themselves are most easily accounted for by the hypothesis that the tradition is true.

[1] *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed. pp. 182-189.

[2] *Luke the Physician*, E.T., pp. 26f.

meeting in Gal. ii.,[1] and in particular it makes Paul agree to a settlement of the question between Jewish and Gentile Christians, which is hard to reconcile with his principles, and harder still to reconcile with his silence in regard to any such settlement in the Epistle to the Galatians and the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Two distinct questions are raised: (1) How far is the narrative of Acts xv. to be regarded as historical? (2) If in important points it is not historical, are the errors such that they are incompatible with the hypothesis of Lucan authorship?

We deal with the former question first. There can be little doubt that the narrative in Acts xv. is a free composition. We have no reason to suspect that the author was present. The speeches will have been composed by the author, after the manner of ancient historians, to suit the occasion, and they cannot be trusted to reproduce what was actually said. James, the leader of the Jerusalem Church, is made to support his argument by a passage of prophecy which derives its point from a mistranslation of the LXX (*v.* 17). The narrative of the outcome of the conference, as recorded in Acts, must likewise be regarded as subject to grave doubt. The difficulties involved in the supposition that Paul formally accepted the decree on that occasion as a settlement of the controversy are hard to surmount, unless with Harnack we accept the reading of the Western Text which converts the decree from a food-law into an assertion of the moral code. But Harnack's view is open to objection both on grounds of textual and historical probability, and it has not in general commended itself.[2]

---

[1] The theory that Galatians was written before the Council of Acts xv. and that the conference of Galatians ii. took place on the occasion of the visit recorded in Acts xi. has won support from many scholars: Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 55 f.; Turner, art. 'Chronology,' Hastings' *D.B.*; Kirsopp Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 279 f.; C. W. Emmet in *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. pp. 271 f. On this theory the immediate historical objections to the narrative of Acts are greatly diminished. But they do not disappear, and other difficulties remain which it is impossible to discuss here. Cf. Windisch, *op. cit.* p. 322. See also Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, pp. 112, 116 f., 125 f. Burkitt argues for an early date for Galatians and an equally early date for Romans i.-xiv.

[2] Cf. Windisch, *op. cit.* p. 324; and for literature, p. 325, n. 1.

It is less clear that admission of the historical improbabilities involved in Acts xv. necessitates the denial of the Lucan authorship of Luke-Acts. In any comparison of Acts with the Pauline Epistles it is essential to start by recognising the different aims and different circumstances of the two writers. St. Paul's Epistles were written in the heat of the conflict by one of the protagonists. They bear witness at once to St. Paul's fervent loyalty to principle, when he felt principle to be at stake, and also to his anxiety to make his position sure, and, wherever possible, to conciliate. "To the Jews," he writes (1 Cor. ix. 20), "I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews . . . to the weak I became weak that I might win the weak; I have been all things to all men that by all means I may save some. And all things I do, because of the Gospel. . . ." It is not surprising that his conduct should appear inconsistent, and that he should have been misunderstood. Acts, written at least a generation later, is concerned to trace the main stages in the expansion and consolidation of the Church. The controversies are past and almost forgotten; the writer is more interested in the fact that a settlement was reached than in the principles which had been at stake. His work reflects the point of view of the next generation. Luke was not present at the conference at Jerusalem. His association with the Apostle implied in Acts xvi. was of short duration. It is only from the time of the last journey to Jerusalem, some six years later, that we have reason to suppose a continuous and prolonged companionship with St. Paul. We need not assume that he ever attained to an inner comprehension of the Apostle's teaching. He may not have conceived the idea of his history until some considerable time after the deaths of Peter, Paul, and James in the seventh decade of the century, and by then the common mind of the Church was tending to lose sight of earlier differences in a growing veneration for its apostolic founders. We may fairly conjecture that this was the atmosphere in which Acts xv. was written. The decree was not a fiction, for we seem to have an echo of its terms in the Book of Revelation (ii. 24). Perhaps Paul had accepted it at some time and place as a *modus vivendi*, and perhaps this had lived in tradition.

The meeting at Jerusalem was not a fiction, for we know from Galatians that a settlement of some kind was reached. It does not seem certain that one who had been a companion of St. Paul, with some such *data* as these at his disposal, could not have composed the narrative of Acts xv. It is one of several historical scenes sketched by the writer in free hand on the basis of traditional material to mark turning-points in the development of the history. It may be grouped with the preaching at Nazareth, the commission of the risen Lord, the Ascension, Pentecost, Paul's interview with the Jewish leaders in Rome, as a free creation of the author's historical imagination.

Discrepancies between St. Paul's teaching as it is represented in Acts, and as it is attested by the Epistles, are alleged against authorship by a companion of St. Paul. It is certainly true that no one would receive from Acts alone an impression of the characteristic notes of Pauline teaching.[1] The author of Acts conventionalises Paul's message and is too anxious to shew that Paul's teaching is identical with the teaching of the Old Testament properly understood (Acts xxvi. 22). The *auctor ad Theophilum* had not grasped the inwardness of the Pauline Gospel. But that does not necessarily prove that he was not a companion of St. Paul; and the discrepancies have been sometimes exaggerated.[2]

If, with Harnack, E. Meyer, Streeter, we accept the traditional ascription of authorship as correct, the author was a physician. It is natural to examine the books to see whether they afford evidence of the author's calling.

---

[1] The doctrine of Justification appears only in Acts xiii. 38, and this verse conveys no impression of the importance of the question of the Law in the whole structure of St. Paul's thought.

[2] E.g. Windisch (*op. cit.* p. 334) contrasts the picture of Paul in Acts claiming to be one with the Pharisees in his doctrine of the Resurrection with the teaching of 1 Cor. xv., where, Windisch says, "the whole belief in the resurrection was based on the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, which the Jews denied." The contrast is overstated. The Pharisaic doctrine which Paul inherited still stands behind 1 Cor. xv. In that chapter Paul is arguing with Greek unbelievers who questioned the belief in a resurrection of the dead, and he appeals to the resurrection of Jesus, belief in which was in some sort common to him and to them. It would not be inconsistent with this for Paul to feel himself at one with the Pharisees in holding belief in a general resurrection, even though the Pharisees did not accept Christ as 'the firstfruits.'

A very full comparison of the Lucan vocabulary with the terms and vocabulary of the Greek medical writers led Hobart (*Medical Language of St. Luke*, 1882) to the conclusion that "a prevailing tinge of medical diction permeates the entire works, and shews the hand of a medical author continuously from the first verse of the Gospel to the last of the Acts of the Apostles." It has been generally agreed that many of Hobart's parallels are not relevant, but Harnack, after sifting Hobart's evidence, held it to be proved that the Gospel and Acts come from the pen of a physician. Similar conclusions were reached by Zahn and Moffatt. More recently the evidence has been examined with great thoroughness by Dr. Cadbury (*Harvard Theological Studies*, vi. pt. i. 'Diction of Luke and Acts'). He shews that almost all the words that have been alleged as distinctively medical are found not only in medical writers, but also in the LXX, Lucian, Josephus, or Plutarch, or in some combination of these writers. If the language of Luke proves that he was a physician, the language of Lucian proves with equal cogency that Lucian was a physician. Moreover, a proof of authorship by a physician would in any case be difficult to obtain, for Greek medical writers, unlike their successors of to-day, drew upon the living language for their terms, and no very clear line can be drawn between technical and non-technical language. As against Hobart, Zahn, Harnack, who claimed that the Lucan vocabulary *proves* the author to have been a physician, Cadbury has said the necessary and decisive word. But he has not demolished the relevance of *some* of the evidence which has been collected, and in a few cases he has unduly depreciated the force of the medical parallels. The case must be stated in a more tentative fashion than it was by Hobart and Harnack: a good and early tradition assigns these works to a man who is spoken of as 'the beloved physician'; the tradition has been disputed, but not disproved; the question is whether the language of the book confirms an existing tradition.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Moffatt, *Expositor*, July 24, 1922.

The following passages deserve notice :

In Acts xxviii. (a 'we' section) the author implies that he was a successful healer, since he was honoured by the inhabitants of Melita along with St. Paul for the successful cures that were wrought. This need not imply more than that the writer was a 'faith-healer,' but since there is in any case a high probability that the 'we' sections go back to Luke the physician, it may be conjectured that the diarist helped with professional aid. It is noteworthy, therefore, that he describes with some particularity the disease from which Publius, the principal patient, suffered : 'dysentery and fever.' No doubt that might have been recorded by one who was not a physician, but it is not the less a confirmation of the tradition.

Some of the Lucan modifications of the Marcan source when disease is in question may reflect the interest and phraseology of a professional physician :

Luke, iv. 38, for *πυρέσσουσα* (Mk.) writes *συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*. We learn from Galen (*vide* note *ad loc.*) that it was customary (*σύνηθες*) with physicians to distinguish fevers by the terms *μέγας* and *σμικρός*. The adjective *μέγας* with *πυρετός* appears not to be quoted from any but medical writers. It is used elsewhere by Galen himself, and by Aretaeus, a medical writer of the first century.[1]

Luke, v. 12, for λεπρός (Mk.) writes *ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας*. *πλήρης* is often used of disease by Hippocrates, and the modification of Mark's word would perhaps be natural to a physician.[2]

Luke, viii. 44, for *ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς* (Mk.) writes *ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς*. *στῆναι* is the usual word in medical writers to denote the stoppage of a discharge. At this same place Luke omits the Marcan statement that the woman had spent all her substance on physicians, and had grown worse rather than better. A layman might have thus tempered the story : a physician could hardly fail to do so.

---

[1] See Hobart, p. 4. Dr. Cadbury does not materially weaken the force of this medical parallel by noting that Luke frequently uses the adjective *μέγας* in other connexions.

[2] This case is less striking than the preceding. Cadbury quotes Soph. *Antig.* 1052 *τῆς νόσου πλήρης ἔφυς*.

These passages do not compel the conclusion that the author was a physician; but the tradition being what it is, they are not without weight.

According to Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 4) Luke was a physician of Antioch. Eusebius does not give the authority for his statement, but it may have been Julius Africanus[1] (*flor.* first half of the third century). The same statement is found in the 'Monarchian' prologue to the Gospel. There is nothing improbable in the tradition, and, if Luke was the author of Acts, it would explain his evident familiarity with and interest in the Antiochene Church. We may further note that at Acts xi. 28 (the prophecy of Agabus at Antioch) the Western Text introduces a 'we' clause. It is very unlikely that the reading is original, but it may reflect early tradition.

The later traditions concerning the evangelist have little claim to be regarded as history. There was a natural tendency to look for further traces of the supposed author of St. Paul's Gospel in St. Paul's Epistles. The identification of Luke with the unnamed 'brother' of 2 Cor. viii. 18, "whose praise in the Gospel is in all the churches," first appears in Origen's *Homilies on St. Luke.* The tradition found in the "Monarchian" prologue, in Jerome, and in Gregory Nazianzen, that Luke wrote the Gospel in Achaia is probably a further inference from this identification.

The supposed remains of the Evangelist were translated by Constantius II. probably from Thebes in Boeotia to the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople together with the remains of St. Andrew in the year A.D. 357.[2]

The tradition that Luke was a painter is found in Nicephorus Callistus (fourteenth century),[3] who relates on the authority of Theodorus Lector (prob. sixth century) that the Empress Eudocia sent to Pulcheria from Jerusalem the *icon* of the Mother of God painted by the Apostle Luke.

---

[1] Cf. Cadbury in *Beginnings*, ii. p. 247. Cadbury (*op. cit.*) gives a convenient collection of ancient *testimonia* concerning Luke.

[2] Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, vii. See also Lagrange, p. xix, on the account in the *Passion of St. Artemius* which appears to be taken from Philostorgius.

[3] Migne, *P.G.* lxxxvi. 165.

## THE DATE

We have no evidence to fix the date of the Gospel with any exactness. It was certainly written after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, for in *c.* xxi. the evangelist makes Jesus allude to the circumstances of the siege and to the subsequent dispersion of the Jews. Other allusions more or less explicit to the fall of Jerusalem which are peculiar to this Gospel (xix. 27, 41-44, xxiii. 27 f.) confirm this conclusion. Blass and Harnack have revived an argument of scholars of the Renaissance for a date in the early sixties. The conclusion of Acts before the martyrdom of Paul can only be explained, it is said, if that event had not yet taken place. Acts was therefore written before the conclusion of the Apostle's imprisonment, and the Gospel still earlier. The language used in the Gospel about the siege of Jerusalem, it is urged, is not decisive against this dating. There is no difficulty in supposing that the siege was actually foretold. Other such cases of prophecy are well authenticated. Blass cites Savonarola's prophecy of the sack of Rome by the French under Charles VIII. In itself *c.* xxi. might be compatible with this early date, but when the Lucan text of *c.* xxi. is compared with Mark xiii., which it may be taken as certain that the evangelist had before him, it becomes impossible to give a convincing interpretation of the Lucan text except on the assumption that the siege was past history, and that the evangelist has modified his source in the light of an event, well known to all his readers, which required to be placed in the scheme of the history of salvation. The Gospel, then, was certainly written after A.D. 70, and probably not immediately after. The author and his readers seem to look back reflectively upon the fall of Jerusalem from a certain distance. The 'times of the Gentiles' have set in.

No certain *terminus ad quem* can be fixed. Acts was possibly known to Clement of Rome (A.D. 96),[1] and the Gospel was almost certainly known to the fourth Evangelist.[2] The friendly attitude towards the Roman administration is in favour of a date prior to the persecutions under Domitian. Moreover, it is in favour of a date earlier rather than later in the last decades of the first century that Acts appears to be written in entire independence of the Pauline Epistles.[1] Not only is St. Paul's activity as a letter-writer not referred to, but the accounts of his relations with the Church at Jerusalem and with the Church at Corinth shew no dependence on the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Corinthians.

---

[1] See Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 532.

[2] See Additional Note, 'St. Luke and St. John.'

Certainty is not attainable: a date about 80–85 would harmonise with the considerations which we have noted, and would allow without difficulty for authorship by a former companion of St. Paul. But the possibility of a date somewhat later in the century cannot be ruled out.

It has been held that Luke-Acts can be shewn to be dependent on the *Antiquities* of Josephus.[2] If this were established, it would fix the date as not earlier than 93 or 94, when the *Antiquities* was published. The principal arguments for dependence are based on the references to Lysanias as tetrarch of Abilene in Lk. iii. 1, and to the risings under Theudas and Judas of Galilee in the speech of Gamaliel (Acts v. 35 f.). In both these cases, it is argued, Luke has made a historical blunder, and in both cases an explanation is forthcoming on the supposition that Luke has read somewhat hastily, and misread, the *Antiquities*. In the case of Lysanias it is probable that there is no mistake to explain.[3] In the case of Gamaliel's speech there can be little doubt that Luke has made a mistake in placing the rising of Theudas *before* the rising under Judas the Galilean at the time of the enrolment. The suggestion is that the mistake arose from a misreading of Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 5, where Josephus, after recording the destruction of Theudas, proceeds to relate that the procurator Alexander put to death some *sons* of that Judas of Galilee who had incited the Jews to revolt at the time of

---

[1] Wendland, however, thinks that Acts xv. deliberately corrects the impression of Peter's position conveyed in Gal. ii., and that the author of Acts knew a collection of Pauline Epistles, *Hell.-röm. Kultur*, pp. 319 n. 2, 333.

[2] Holtzmann, *Z.W.T.*, 1873, pp. 85-93; Krenkel, *Josephus u. Lukas* (1894); Schmiedel, art. 'Lysanias and Theudas' in *E. Bibl.*; Burkitt, *Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 105 f.

[3] See Additional Note, 'Lysanias of Abilene.'

Quirinius. The verbal parallels between Acts v. and *Ant.* xx. 5 are not very striking, and it seems much more likely that a skilful writer like Luke should have confused his recollections or his notes than that he should have misread a plain text. Furthermore, as Schürer has shewn,[1] Luke elsewhere frequently shews independence of Josephus, where, had he known him, he might have been expected to follow him. We conclude, therefore, that the alleged dependence of Luke upon Josephus is not proven.

---

[1] Schürer, *Z.W.T.*, 1876, pp. 574-582. The evidence is conveniently stated and reviewed by Hunkin in *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1919.

# II

# HISTORY OF THE GOSPEL AND OF ITS INTERPRETATION

## (i.) The Gospel in the Second Century

As we have already seen, Irenaeus (writing about A.D. 185) is the earliest writer who refers to the Gospel as the work of Luke. But we have ample evidence of the use of the Gospel more than a generation earlier both by recognised Church writers and by leaders of Christian Gnosticism.

The Didache in its extant form shews dependence upon both the Matthaean and the Lucan forms of the Great Sermon. The following clauses are equivalent to Luke and have no exact parallel in Matthew :

| Did. i. | Lk. vi. |
|---|---|
| 3. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν. | 28. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς. |
| . . . . . | |
| ποία γὰρ χάρις, ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς ; | 32. καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; |
| 5. παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει. | 30. παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει. |

But Did. i. 3-ii. 1 is not found in the Latin version, in Barnabas, or in the Apostolic Church Order, and is very probably an early interpolation.

Did. xvi. 1 affords another parallel to a passage peculiar to Luke of the canonical evangelists :

| Mt. xxv. 13 | Did. xvi. 1 | Lk. xii. |
|---|---|---|
| γρηγορεῖτε οὖν (the parable of the virgins and their lamps has preceded), ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν. | γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν· οἱ λύχνοι ὑμῶν μὴ σβεσθήτωσαν, καὶ αἱ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκλυέσθωσαν, ἀλλὰ γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι· οὐ γὰρ οἴδατε τὴν ὥραν ἐν ᾗ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἔρχεται. | 35. ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι, καὶ οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι . . .<br>40. καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ᾗ ὥρᾳ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται (*v.* 40 = Mt. xxiv. 44). |

But again the evidence is not decisive. Lk. xii. 35 may come from Q, and it is possible that the Didache echoes Q, not Luke (so Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 511).[1]

There is no clear evidence that Ignatius knew St. Luke. In *Smyrn.* i. 2 it is said that Jesus was crucified 'under Pontius Pilate and Herod.' The two names are coupled together in connexion with the death of Jesus in the Lucan writings alone in the N.T., but the association in tradition is probably older than Luke, and may have come independently to Ignatius. The words of the Risen Christ in *Smyrn.* iii. are similar to those in the narrative Lk. xxiv. 36 f., but they do not appear to be dependent on Luke.

There is no trace of the influence of Luke in the Epistle of Barnabas, which appears to use Matthew only of the Gospels. There is no clear case of dependence on Luke in the Epistle of Clement of Rome.[2] *The Shepherd* of Hermas, as we should expect from the nature of the book, contains no direct quotations either from the Old Testament or from Apostolic writings. But there are undoubted echoes from the synoptic Gospels. In general the resemblance seems closest to Matthew and Mark, yet he may have used Luke too.[3] We have no positive evidence that Papias knew Luke.

The Apocryphal Gospel according to Peter is dated by Lake between 100 and 135, by Turner[4] between 115 and 140. It appears to shew acquaintance with each of the four canonical Gospels.[5] The trial before Herod (*cc.* i., ii.) and the repentance of the crucified robber (*c.* iv.) are probably derived from Luke. This hypothesis is strengthened by a number of verbal similarities between Luke and 'Peter':

Peter iv. 10. *κακοῦργοι* of the crucified malefactors.
=Lk. xxiii. 32, 33, 39. (Mt. and Mk. *λῃσταί.*)

---

[1] The Didache is included here for convenience. It is not intended to express an opinion as to its date. There is much to be said for the date 80–100. Cf. Turner, *Studies in Early Church History*, p. 31; Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, pp. 279 f.

[2] Plummer, pp. lxxiv f.

[3] Cf. esp. *Sim.* v. ii. 4 with Lk. xiii. 8, 9, and for other possible reminiscences see Stanton, *Gosp. as Hist. Doc.* i. p. 74.

[4] *Study of New Testament*, p. 12.

[5] See art. by C. H. Turner in *J.Th.S.*, Jan. 1913.

Peter ii. *σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει.*
ix. *ἐπιφώσκοντος τοῦ σαββάτου.* Cf. Lk. xxiii. 54.
viii. *κόπτεται τὰ στήθη.* Cf. Lk. xxiii. 48.
viii. *ἴδετε ὁπόσον δίκαιός ἐστιν.* Cf. Lk. xxiii. 47.
ix. *καὶ εἶδον (οἱ στρατιῶται) ἀνοιχθέντας τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ δύο ἄνδρας κατελθόντας ἐκεῖθεν.* Cf. Lk. xxiv. 4.

About the middle of the second century the third canonical Gospel was, with St. Matthew's Gospel, one of the principal authorities used by Justin Martyr for the life and teaching of Jesus Christ.[1] He makes direct reference to a number of passages peculiar to St. Luke: Elizabeth, the Baptist's mother; the annunciation to Mary; the census under Quirinius; the inn at Bethlehem; Jesus thirty years old at the beginning of his ministry; Jesus sent by Pilate to be tried before Herod; the word from the cross, "Father, into thy hands . . ."[2]

Justin's frequent and confident use of the Gospel in the middle of the century may be taken to prove that in the course of the earlier decades of the second century the Gospel had won a secure place as an authority for the teaching and work of Jesus Christ. This conclusion is confirmed by the probable use of the Gospel by the Gnostic heresiarchs Basilides and Valentinus, and its certain use by Marcion.

Basilides of Alexandria (who flourished shortly before the middle of the second century) composed twenty-four books *Εἰς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον*.[3] Like all the original writings of the chief Gnostics this work has perished and its exact character is uncertain, but from a very obscure reference in the *Disputatio Archelai et Manetis*[4] it appears that the thirteenth book began with a treatment of the problem of evil in the form of an exposition of the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi.) Again, Hippolytus in discussing Basilides apparently makes either Basilides himself or his son Isidore refer to Luke i. 35, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee . . ."[1]

---

[1] The first *Apology* of Justin cannot be exactly dated, but it is probably not earlier than 150. The *Dialogue* is later than the *Apology* to which it refers (*c.* 120), but was apparently written, like the *Apology*, in the reign of Antoninus Pius and therefore prior to A.D. 161.

[2] 1 *Apol.* 34; *Dial.* 78, 88, 100, 103, 105, 106.

[3] Eus. *H.E.* iv. 7, on the authority of Agrippa Castor. It is no doubt to this book that Clement (*Strom.* iv. 12, pp. 599, 600) refers as the *Ἐξηγητικά* of Basilides, quoting from book xxiii.

[4] Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* v. p. 197: "[Manes only repeats the theories of Basilides.] Extat enim tertius decimus liber tractatuum eius (i.e. of Basilides) cuius initium tale est: *Tertium decimum nobis tractatuum scribentibus librum, necessarium sermonem uberemque salutaris sermo praestavit.* Per parvulam (? parabolam) divitis et pauperis †naturam† sine radice et sine loco rebus super-

The evidence for the use of the Lucan Gospel by Valentinus is less certain. Hippolytus[2] seems to imply that Valentinus too made use of the same text from Luke (i. 35), but the method of quotation is ambiguous and it is not certain that Valentinus is to be supplied as subject to the verb φησί.[3]

Ptolemaeus, a disciple of Valentinus, and one of the most important Gnostic teachers at the time of Irenaeus, probably used the entire Gospel Canon. Irenaeus[4] quotes examples of Ptolemaeus's method of interpretation which include passages from Matthew, Luke, and John.

Another Valentinian Gnostic, Heracleon, was probably the first writer to produce a commentary on Christian Scriptures. Besides his commentary on St. John, of which considerable extracts have been preserved in Origen, he wrote also a commentary on Luke, fragments of which (on Luke xii. 8-11) are quoted by Clement (*Strom.* iv. 9, p. 595 Potter).

The heresiarch Marcion appears to have been the first to construct a formal Canon of Christian Scripture. This work was achieved between the years 139 and 144, while Marcion was living in Rome. His Gospel was an edition of the Gospel according to St. Luke, from which all passages which implied the divine authority of the Old Testament and the reality of Christ's physical body were systematically eliminated. By this procedure Marcion believed that he was reconstructing the true and original version of the Gospel and purging it of interpolations for which Judaising Christians were responsible. Marcion's Gospel omitted the accounts of the births of John the Baptist and Jesus, the Mission of John

---

venientem, unde pullulaverit indicat." For a discussion of the passage see Hort, *s.v.* Basilides, *D.C.B.* p. 276. The *Disputatio* is assigned to the close of the third century or a little later.

[1] *Refut.* vii. 26.

[2] *Refut.* vi. 35.

[3] On this ambiguity see Stanton, *Gospels as Hist. Documents*, i. pp. 68 f.

[4] *Adv. Haeres.* i. cc. viii., xx., xxv.

the Baptist and his baptism of Jesus, the genealogy, the temptation. The Gospel began with iv. 31, to which was prefixed the first clause of iii. 1, the section iv. 16-30 being abbreviated and transferred to follow iv. 31 f. As characteristic examples of the many alterations introduced by Marcion in the body of the Gospel, we may note that at xiii. 28 for *Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας* he read *τοὺς δικαίους*, and for *ἐκβαλλομένους*, *κρατουμένους*, and that at xvi. 17 for *τοῦ νόμου* he read *τῶν λόγων μου*.[1]

In the generation succeeding Marcion, and probably in large measure under the impulse which he imparted, the Church moved towards the recognition of an authoritative Gospel Canon. The fourfold Canon, giving the Gospel according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, must have been well established at Rome when Tatian compiled the *Diatessaron* about 170. The idea of the fourfold Canon was so deeply woven into the texture of the mind of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lugdunum, that the four Gospels are to him four pillars whereon the Church rests, corresponding to the four quarters of the world, the four chief winds, the four faces of the Cherubim.[2] In Antioch and in Asia Minor at the same period the fourfold Canon appears to have been as well established as it was in the West.

In one of his letters St. Jerome refers to a commentary on the four Gospels which bore the name of Theophilus who was Bishop of Antioch *c.* 180.[3] Jerome seems to say that Theophilus had first made a harmony of the four Gospels (*quattuor evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens*). In answer to Algasia's enquiries, he quotes Theophilus's interpretation of the parable of the Unjust Steward, according to which the rich man represents God, and the unjust steward St. Paul; St. Paul was an unjust steward of the Law, who after his conversion said within himself: "I will do what I judge to be useful for myself, that when I am cast out of the stewardship, the Christians may receive me into their houses." If the work which St. Jerome quotes was really the work of Theophilus of Antioch, it is by far the earliest New Testament commentary (apart from the works of Basilides and Heracleon referred to above) of which we have any record. But in his notice of Theophilus in the *De viris illustribus* Jerome himself shews hesitation on grounds of style in accepting Theophilus as the author of the commentary.[1]

---

[1] The authorities for the text of Marcion's Gospel are Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iv.; Adamantius, *Dial.*; Epiph. *Adv. Haeres.* 42. See Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 48 f. and 159* f.

[2] *Adv. Haeres.* iii. 11.

[3] Epist. 121 (151) *ad Algasiam*, Migne, *P.L.* xxii. 1020.

It may be added that whether or not Theophilus wrote the commentary to which Jerome refers, he certainly used the Gospel according to St. Luke,[2] and almost certainly recognised the fourfold Canon.[3]

For the Churches of Asia Minor we may probably make use of the evidence of the recently discovered *Epistula Apostolorum*[4] which shews dependence upon the four canonical Gospels. This work is supposed by Schmidt to have been composed in Asia Minor by an orthodox Christian about the year 160.

In the later decades of the second century and from this time forward the Gospel according to St. Luke took its place as a matter of course alongside the other three, as a part of the inspired apostolic scriptures in which the Christian revelation was contained and expressed. With the formation of the Canon the history of primitive Christian literature is brought to its close, and there begins the epoch of patristic literature in the stricter sense of the term,[5] for which the Apologists had prepared the way. In the patristic period the authority of the Scriptures both of the Old and of the

---

[1] See Harnack, *Altchr. Lit.* i. p. 498. The extant Latin commentary on the four Gospels which passes under the name of Theophilus has been proved by Harnack to be neither the work of Theophilus himself, nor yet the work referred to by Jerome. It is the work of a late Latin compiler who probably wrote in S. Gaul towards the end of the fifth century, and drew upon the writings of Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, pseudo-Arnobius Junior, and Augustine. *Texte u. Unters.* i. 4, pp. 97 f.

[2] *Ad Autolycum,* ii. 13; cf. Lk. xviii. 27.

[3] *Ib.* ii. 22; he quotes Jo. i. 1 as the words of John, one of the πνευματοφόροι, whom he mentions in the same breath with αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαί.

[4] Ed. C. Schmidt, *Texte u. Unters.*, 1919.

[5] On the importance of this distinction see the classical treatment by Overbeck, 'Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur,' *Historische Zeitschrift* (N.F.), 1882, xii. pp. 417 f.

New Testament is settled and presupposed. In spite of certain doubtful questions, the Canon of Apostolic Scripture is, in principle, closed. The history of St. Luke's Gospel becomes a part of the history of the New Testament.

In the mind of the Church the four Gospels were four inspired and therefore congruous testimonies to the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. It was assumed that apparent discrepancies were in some way capable of reconciliation. Yet though all the four Gospels enjoyed a co-ordinate authority, a certain primacy tended to attach itself to the two Gospels which bear apostolic names: Matthew and John. Thus Tertullian,[1] in criticising Marcion for his mutilation of Luke's Gospel, avows that Luke's Gospel even in its integrity would not suffice by itself, since it did but reproduce the Gospel of Paul, and Paul himself was dependent upon the elder apostles for the Gospel which he had received. The tradition of apostolic authorship relieved the Gospels of St. Matthew and of St. John from such criticism. Moreover we may recognise certain intrinsic excellences in these two Gospels which fitted them to hold the chief places in the Canon. The doctrinal importance and uniqueness of St. John's Gospel is obvious. In St. Matthew's Gospel the systematic groupings of the Lord's sayings and parables made it eminently useful for purposes of teaching and edification, while the solemn citations from prophecy with which the narrative is punctuated served to emphasise the relation of the life of Christ to the whole scheme of Scripture. Very naturally St. Mark's Gospel dropped into the background. It contained little that was not represented elsewhere. St. Luke's Gospel occupied an intermediate position. Though it never quite attained the prestige of the apostolic Gospels of Matthew and John, the extent and the importance of the matter peculiar to Luke, especially the first two chapters and the Lucan parables which lent themselves so readily to allegorical exegesis, ensured the Gospel a prominent place in the mind and imagination of Christendom.

In the great majority of the MSS., the Gospel according to St. Luke stands third in the Canon. The order Matthew, Mark, Luke, John[2] corresponds with the order given by Irenaeus and was probably thought to be chronological. This order eventually prevailed both in East and West, but an earlier tradition in the West followed Tertullian in placing the two apostolic Gospels first and the two Gospels of *apostolici* second. The latter grouping (predominantly in the form Matthew, John, Luke, Mark) is found in Codex Bezae, the Freer Codex (W), most MSS. of the Old Latin,[1] the Gothic version, and the Apostolic Constitutions.

---

[1] *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 2.

[2] The order in syr.cur—Matthew, Mark, John, Luke—is a curious variant.

### (ii.) THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

Origen, the Father of Church commentators, wrote commentaries on St. Luke's Gospel in five books.[2] Except for some fragments, which were probably derived from this work,[3] these commentaries have disappeared. But there has come down to us in a Latin translation by Jerome[4] a collection of homilies on the Gospel which Origen delivered apparently at Caesarea after his withdrawal from Alexandria in A.D. 231. Of this collection of homilies[5]—thirty-nine in all—the first twenty deal with the first two chapters of the Gospel, and the next thirteen with chapters iii. and iv. The remaining six homilies deal sporadically with passages from *c.* x. to *c.* xx. From *In Matt.* tom. xiii. 29, xvi. 9; *In Johan.* tom. xxxii. 2, we learn that Origen wrote other homilies upon the Gospel which are now lost. The homilies of Origen entered extensively into the later tradition of exegesis. Remote and fantastic as the exegesis must often appear to a modern reader, they are fresh and interesting examples of Origen's expository method, and throw much light on beliefs and practice in the Church of the third century. Homily xvii., for example (on Lk. ii. 33-36), illustrates Origen's severity toward second marriages; Homily xxiii. (on Lk. iii. 9-12) deals with the question how prophecies which foretell an immediate judgement are to be interpreted, when "so many ages and unnumbered years have passed from that time to the present day." How natural it was to

---

[1] *k* has the order John, Luke, Mark, Matthew, and Ambrosiaster Matthew, Luke, Mark, John.

[2] Jer. *Prol. Hom. in Luc.*

[3] Lommatzsch, v. pp. 237-244.

[4] Jerome made his translation at Bethlehem in the year 389.

[5] Lommatzsch, v. pp. 85-236.

Origen to regard the text of Scripture as the sacramental covering which enshrined the deeper truths of the divine dispensation is well illustrated by Hom. xii. on Lk. ii. 8-10. Are we to suppose, Origen asks, that the divine word of Scripture means no more than that an angel came to some shepherds and spoke to them ? Not so. "Hear ye, shepherds of the Churches, ye shepherds of God : God's angel ever descends from heaven and declares to you that this day there is born to you a Saviour who is Christ the Lord." But there is a yet more holy meaning to which we may penetrate. There are certain shepherd angels who order the affairs of men. Truly it was great joy to those to whom had been committed the care of men and of their provinces that Christ had come into the world. "Much benefit did that angel receive who directed the affairs of Egypt, after the Lord had come down from heaven, that the Egyptians might become Christians. . . ." Other interesting homilies are the first (on the four Gospels), the third (on the nature of angels), the sixth (which deals with the question why Jesus was not born of a virgin who was *not* betrothed), the fourteenth (on the Purification of Jesus).[1]

Among the works of Eusebius in Migne (*P.G.* xxiv. 529) are printed fragments of a 'commentary' on Luke which have been extracted from four later catenae. The fragments, some fifty-two in number, deal with texts scattered over the Gospel. Some at any rate of the fragments are taken from other extant works of Eusebius, and it is not certain that any of them come from an actual commentary on the Gospel.[2] As an exegete Eusebius stands in the Origenist tradition, and in his other commentaries freely plagiarises from his master.

Fragments of a commentary on St. Luke by Athanasius have been extracted from catenae and are printed in Migne, *P.G.* xxvii. 1391-1404.

Fragments only remain of the work of another fourth-century Greek exegete who wrote homilies on St. Luke : Titus, Bishop of

---

[1] For an excellent summary account of these homilies see B. F. Westcott, art. 'Origenes,' *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.*

[2] See Harnack, *Chronologie*, ii. p. 123.

Bostra—a see on the outposts of the Empire east of Palestine near the edge of the Arabian desert. The homilies on Luke were probably written between 364 and 375.[1] The name of Titus of Bostra appears at the head of a later catena. This is certainly a mistake,[2] but there is no reason to question the authenticity of the numerous scholia which bear the name of Titus. Titus was much occupied in refuting the Manichees. Finding that the allegorical method of interpretation had enabled Mani to read his own erroneous speculations into the text of Scripture, Titus himself adheres to the literal meaning.[3] Though he appears to draw on Origen to some extent,[4] he is in principle an adherent of the Antiochene school.

Both of the great Antiochene exegetes, Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, are said to have commented on the entire Scripture.[5] Some fragments survive of Theodore's commentary on Luke.[6]

The last great independent commentary on St. Luke from the Greek-speaking Church was that of Cyril of Alexandria. In the complete edition of Cyril's voluminous and profoundly influential writings,[7] the greater part is taken up by his commentaries on Scripture. Fragments only survive of the original Greek of the commentary on St. Luke, but a considerable part of the commentary is preserved in a Syriac version in MS. at the British Museum.[8] Cyril's commentaries on the New Testament must have been written after 428, since in the earliest, that on St. John's Gospel, he refers to the Nestorian heresy.[9] The dogmatic interest is very prominent in Cyril's commentary. We seldom find a paragraph in which there is not some carefully chosen phrase which implicitly repudiates Nestorian heresy. Not infrequently the reader feels that the exegete is explaining away the reality of Christ's human experience. In his exposition of Christ's words Cyril is very sober. The elaborate allegorism of the earlier Alexandrine school was not to his taste. Thus in Homily cviii. on the parable of the Unjust Steward he writes: "The parables then indirectly and figuratively explain to us much that is for our edification, provided only we consider their meaning in a brief and summary manner. For we are not to search into all the parts of the parable in a subtle and prying way, lest the argument by its immoderate length weary with superfluous matter even those most fond of hearing. . . . All the parts of the parable, therefore, are not necessarily and in every respect useful for the explanation of the things signified." Similarly in the preceding homily on the Prodigal Son, he states, discusses, and rejects the interpretation which would interpret the upright son of the holy angels and the prodigal of the fallen human race, likewise the interpretation of the elder son as the Jewish people, and the interpretation of the fatted calf as representative of the person of the Saviour; and he is only willing to find one clue to the parable—that which is laid down by the evangelist himself, when he says of Christ a little before the parable: "And all the publicans and sinners drew near unto him to hear him. And the Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them."

---

[1] Sickenberger, *Texte u. Unters.* xxi. 1, pp. 108 f.

[2] See below, pp. xxxvii f.

[3] Tit. Bost. *Contra Manich.* iv. 96.

[4] Sickenberger, *op. cit.* p. 114.

[5] Leontius, *De sectis*, iv. 3.

[6] Migne, *P.G.* lxvi. 715-728.

[7] Migne, *P.G.* lxviii.-lxxvii.

[8] Ed. R. Payne Smith, Oxford, 1858. Translated by the same, 2 vols., Oxford, 1859. Fragments of a Syriac version of homilies by Cyril on St. Luke are also preserved in a Nitrian MS., ed. by W. Wright, London, 1874.

[9] Bardenhewer, *Patrology* (E.T.), p. 364.

The exegetical literature from the Latin-speaking Church in the early centuries is comparatively meagre. One large Latin commentary on St. Luke has come down to us—that by St. Ambrose. The *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam libris decem comprehensa* is the longest single work of Ambrose. The commentary itself was published not earlier than 388,[1] but it is based upon homilies which had been already delivered in public. After his elevation to the episcopate Ambrose devoted himself to the study of theology under the direction of Simplicianus, who afterwards succeeded him. He made an especial study of the Greek Fathers, Clement, Origen, Basil, Didymus the Blind. He also read Philo. Like Origen he recognised a triple meaning in Scripture, the natural, the mystical, and the moral. "In the commentary on St. Luke," says Bardenhewer, "the biblical text is made to serve purposes of instruction and edification, but with a thorough ignoring of all the rules of her-

[1] Bardenhewer, *op. cit.* p. 435.

meneutics, and frequently in so forced and artificial a manner as to make it hard to follow with any ease the mental process of the interpreter." "In verbis ludit, in sententiis dormitat," Jerome wrote of this work.[1]

Very different in character from the commentary of Ambrose are the 52 *Quaestiones* on separate texts in St. Luke which make up the second of the two books *Quaestionum evangeliorum* of St. Augustine. The allegorical exegesis is frequently fantastic enough, as for instance the interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan, where the traveller represents the human race, Jerusalem the blessed city of peace which fallen man has left, while Jericho, meaning the moon which by its changing phases symbolises mortality, represents the goal for which the fallen race is bound; the Good Samaritan himself is the Saviour, the oil and the wine the two precepts of love, the inn where the stranger is left the Church, and the interval which is to intervene before the Samaritan's return, the interval before the Resurrection.[2] Or again, when the number of the seventy-two disciples symbolises the universal illumination of the Gospel of the Trinity, since the sun takes twenty-four hours to run its course and 24 × 3 = 72. To us all this seems fanciful, but the reader is never in doubt as to what the exegete means, and though the form is fantastic, the interpretation is vigorous and reveals a master's hand and mind.

The four books of Augustine, *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, were written about this same period (A.D. 400). Their aim is to reconcile apparent discrepancies between the evangelists. Augustine makes St. Matthew his foundation. Mark he holds to be an abbreviation of St. Matthew. For some reason, which the devout enquirer may be able to discover, the Holy Spirit permitted the sacred writers to record the same events in different order. Yet Augustine is anxious to make it clear that there is no real discrepancy between one Gospel and another.

Two other Latin books may be mentioned: *Adnotationes*

---

[1] *Prol. in Hom. Orig. in Luc.*

[2] Similar interpretations of the Parable of the Good Samaritan are given by Orig. *Hom.* xxxiv. and by Ambrose (Migne, *P.L.* xv. 1527). Cyril of Alexandria, on the other hand, confines himself, as usual, to the plain meaning of the text.

*ad quaedam evangeliorum loca* (Migne, *P.L.* liii. pp. 569 f.), a collection of scholia on passages in Matthew, Luke, and John attributed to Arnobius junior, but erroneously.[1] They have been incorporated into the Pseudo-Theophilus.[2]

Eucherius of Lerins, Bishop of Lyon *c.* 424, died *c.* 450,[3] wrote two books of *Instructiones* to his son Salonius (Migne, *P.L.* l. pp. 773 f.). The former contains two chapters on the Old and New Testaments respectively with questions and answers on difficulties in Books of the Bible. There are nine such questions on St. Luke. Both the questions and answers are poor.

### (iii.) From the Sixth Century to the End of the Middle Age

After the fifth Christian century the impulse to write fresh commentaries on the books of Scripture was exhausted. For more than a thousand years the task of a Biblical commentator was reduced to that of compiling and ordering extracts from the exegetical literature of the Patristic Age.[4] The transition to the age of the compilers is formally recognised by the 19th Canon of the Trullan Synod (Quinisexta) summoned by Justinian II. in A.D. 692.[5] This Canon expressly instructs the clergy to confine their expositions of Scripture to the teaching of the Fathers, and to refrain from expositions of their own.

The catena bearing the name of Titus of Bostra, to which reference has already been made, is based upon the commentary of Cyril of Alexandria. Besides Titus of Bostra, the author draws upon Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, Chrysostom, Dionysius the Areopagite, Isidore of Pelusium. It probably dates from the sixth century.

The catena on Luke published by Cramer is an expansion of pseudo-Titus. It comes from the same hand as catenae on Matthew and John. The latest author quoted is the priest and monk Thalassios, *c.* 650.[1] The catena probably dates from *c.* 700. Some fifty fragments of Titus of Bostra are included. The author went back to original sources.

---

[1] Bardenhewer, *op. cit.* p. 604. Dom Morin holds that this Arnobius was an Illyrian who lived in Rome.

[2] Cf. above, p. xxx, n. 1.

[3] Bardenhewer, *op. cit.* p. 518.

[4] On Catenae see Alb. Ehrhard in Karl Krumbacher's *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, München, 1897, pp. 206-218, and Lietzmann. 'Catenen,' *Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte u. handschriftliche Überlieferung*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1897.

[5] Hefele, iii. pp. 328 f.; Mansi, xi. p. 952.

The catena of Nicetas[2] on St. Luke dates from about 1080, when its author was Deacon and Didaskalos of Hagia Sophia.[3] The catena, which contains about 3300 scholia, is based mainly on the homilies of Cyril of Alexandria on Luke, and those of Chrysostom on Matthew. He also makes extensive use of Titus of Bostra. Nicetas generally goes back to original texts and generally gives both the author of his quotation and the book from which it is taken.

Two other Byzantine commentators were more or less contemporary with Nicetas. Euthymius Zigabenus,[4] a monk of the monastery τῆς περιβλέπτου in Constantinople and a theologian of high repute in the reign of Alexios Komnenos (1081–1118), wrote commentaries on the Psalms and the Gospels. His main sources are the Cappadocian Fathers and Chrysostom. Occasionally he allows himself an interpretation of his own.

Theophylact, Archbishop of Achrida in Bulgaria some time before 1078, wrote commentaries on many books of the Old Testament and all of the New. In the Commentary on Matthew, to which he often refers in writing on the other Gospels, he draws largely upon Chrysostom, but also upon others of the Fathers. It is said that Theophylact uses mainly the same patristic passages as Euthymius, and the exact relation between the two is uncertain.[5] Since the Commentary of Theophylact on Acts is essentially identical with that of 'Oecumenius,' the originality of his other work is suspect.

A catena on Luke by Makarios Chrysokephalos, Metropolitan of Philadelphia in the middle of the fourteenth century, is confined to sections peculiar to Luke. It appears not to have been completed. The bulk of the material comes from Nicetas. There are a few

[1] Quoted *Matt. Catena*, ed. Cramer, 197. 14 f.

[2] Sickenberger, *T.u.U.* xxii. (N.F. vii.), Heft 4.

[3] He later became Metropolitan of Heraclea in Thrace.

[4] See Krumbacher, *op. cit.* pp. 82 f.

[5] Krumbacher, *op. cit.* p. 84.

fresh extracts from other writers, early and late, and some few notes, bearing his own monogram, by himself.[1]

We return now to the Western Church. After the downfall of the Western Empire, the first work on the Gospel which calls for mention is that of the Venerable Bede († 735). Bede's commentary, as we are told in the prefatory letter to Acca, is chiefly a compilation from the writings of the four Doctors of the Latin Church, but particularly from St. Ambrose. Some things, however, "which the Author of light has opened to him," he has added himself.

The *Glossa ordinaria* [2] on the whole Bible, the work of Walafrid Strabo, Abbot of Reichenau († 849), was a compilation from the Fathers with some original additions, which represented the Biblical scholarship of the Carolingian Renaissance. It retained immense authority throughout the Middle Age, and is quoted by Peter Lombard under the simple designation *auctoritas*. In the twelfth century the *Glossa ordinaria* was further amplified by 'the doctor of doctors,' Anselm of Laon († 1117), and by his pupil Gilbert de la Porrée († 1154). This expanded edition was known as the *Glossa interlinearis*.[3] But it did not supersede the earlier work, and the two authorities were often cited side by side.[4]

The *Expositio continua* on the four Gospels of St. Thomas Aquinas, or as it had already come to be called by 1321 *Catena aurea*, is the greatest of mediaeval commentaries on the Gospels.[5] The catena on Matthew was published between 1262 and 1264 with a dedication to Urban IV. The catenae on the other Gospels followed before 1272. The catena of St. Thomas is distinguished from preceding Latin compilations by an extensive use of the Greek Fathers. Thomas did not select his citations direct from the sources but used a Latin translation of the catena of Nicetas.[1] Of the Latin Fathers he uses Ambrose, Augustine, certain homilies of Gregory, and Bede. The catena is most skilfully constructed. The general method is first to give a discussion on the connexion of a paragraph, for which purpose St. Thomas draws largely upon Cyril and Augustine, *De Consensu*. There follow quòtations which give in order the literal or historical interpretation, followed by other quotations for the allegorical and mystical meanings of the paragraph.

---

[1] Migne, *P.G.* cl. pp. 239-244. See Sickenberger, *T.u.U.* xxi. 1, pp. 47 f.

[2] Migne, *P.L.* cxiv. pp. 243-355, on St. Luke.

[3] See R. L. Poole, *Mediaeval Thought and Learning*,[2] p. 114 n., with references there given.

[4] Other commentators on the Gospel were: Christianus Druthmarus (*c.* 850), Migne, *P.L.* cvi. 1503, on whom see R. Simon, *Hist. Crit. der N.T.* p. 370; Bruno Astensis (†1125), Migne, *P.L.* clxv. 333; Albertus Magnus (†1289). The *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor (twelfth century), the popular mediaeval textbook of Scripture history, contains a section 'Historia Evangelica' (Migne, *P.L.* cxcviii. 1537 f.) which is based on a harmony of the four Gospels.

[5] On the *Catena aurea* see Dissert. v. of the *Dissertationes criticae et apologeticae de gestis et scriptis ac doctrina S. Thomae Aquin.* by the Dominican J. F. Bernhard de Rubeis, Venice, 1750, reprinted in new edition of St. Thomas (Rome, 1882), vol. i. pp. xlv-cccxlvi. The *Catena aurea* was translated into English under Newman's editorship as a supplement to the *Library of the Fathers*. The catena on St. Luke was translated with Preface by Thomas Dudley Rider, 1843.

The *Postillae* of Nicholas of Lyra, a Franciscan of the early fourteenth century, in the main follow the methods of preceding commentators. Nicholas had a considerable knowledge of Hebrew and devoted much ingenuity and erudition to elucidating the use of O.T. quotations in the N.T. Notes by Paul, Bishop of Burgos, a converted Jew, are generally added to the *Postillae* of Nicholas. They are drawn mainly from Jewish sources. Paul sets himself to criticise many of the conclusions of Nicholas of Lyra.[2]

### (iv.) From the Renaissance to the Rise of Historical Criticism

As we approach the modern period the literature on the Gospels grows so extensive that this survey will only attempt to give some statement of the work of the chief writers and to indicate the main characteristics of the different stages in the study of the Gospels.

The age of commentaries in the form of patristic compilations came to an end with the revival of Christian learning in the sixteenth century. The Fathers themselves were now re-edited and widely read in complete texts, and the spirit of a new age incarnate in Erasmus turned attention direct to the newly recovered Greek text of the New Testament. The critical and grammatical notes of Laurentius Valla on the Greek text in the middle of the fifteenth century prepared the way. Erasmus' edition of the Greek text of the New Testament appeared at Basle in 1516. It included a new Latin translation and copious notes which were by no means confined to the strict exposition of the text, but, on occasion, dealt at large with contemporary abuses and corruptions of the Christian religion in the light of the authentic and newly recovered text of the teaching of Christ and his apostles. "The end which Erasmus desired in this work to serve was not so much scientific, as the practical end of Reformation, and therein as a matter of fact lies its historical significance." There is truth in this judgement of Stähelin's,[1] but the antithesis of 'scientific' and 'practical' would have seemed strange to Erasmus. As he saw the situation, the New Testament, recovered by true scholarship, was sitting in judgement on the Church. Erasmus was thus a progenitor both of the Reformation and of the philological studies on the New Testament texts which supervened upon the dogmatic era of the Reformation.

---

[1] See letter *ad Hannibaldum*, quoted *Opera* (Rome), vol. i. p. cvii.

[2] Cf. R. Simon, *op. cit.* pp. 477 f.

In his Greek Testament Erasmus prefixes to the Gospels by way of introduction the lives of the evangelists from St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, and before each of the several Gospels the Greek version of Jerome's life of the evangelist (wrongly ascribed to Sophronius) and the ὑπόθεσις of Theophylact. Erasmus further promoted his purpose of popularising the study of the New Testament by his Paraphrases. The Epistles were done first. The Paraphrase of St. Luke appeared in 1523 with a dedication to Henry VIII., following on the Paraphrases of St. Matthew and of St. John. This work gives a continuous paraphrase and exposition of the text. In his expositions Erasmus draws freely upon the Fathers and by no means neglects the allegorical interpretation. In this he occupied a transitional position, for the general tendency of the New Learning was not favourable to the allegorical exegesis, and the Reformers made it an avowed principle to confine themselves to direct exposition of the literal meaning of the text.

---

[1] Art. 'Erasmus,' Hauck-Herzog, *R.E.*

We have no commentary on any of the Gospels from Luther.[1] Calvin, on the other hand, commented on a harmony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke (1553). Here as elsewhere he shews himself a strong, sensible, and independent expositor. He confines himself to the literal meaning. The controversies of the age play their part in the work.

*Adnotationes in N.T.* by Theodore Beza (1565, 1594) is the most learned of sixteenth-century Protestant commentaries. The doctrinal disputes of the age still play a large part in the work.

The commentary of the Spanish Jesuit Maldonatus (†1583) on the Four Gospels, published posthumously 1596, illustrates the influence of the New Learning on Biblical exposition within the Roman Church of the Counter-Reformation. Like the Protestants, whom he often sets himself to refute, Maldonatus confines himself almost entirely to the literal meaning. He is learned, forceful, judicious, and his commentary acquired a well-deserved fame.

The change which came over exegesis during the sixteenth century is well illustrated by the interpretations of the parable of the Good Samaritan by Erasmus, Calvin, and Maldonatus. Erasmus concludes his paraphrase of the parable by reproducing the familiar patristic interpretation that the Good Samaritan is a figure of Christ and of his beneficent redemption of mankind. Calvin discusses the allegorical interpretations which have been proposed. Some he dismisses as inconclusive in themselves and unsatisfactory on doctrinal grounds. The interpretation of the Good Samaritan as Christ and of the host as the Church, which, he says, has the support of almost everybody, he allows to be plausible in itself. "But," he adds, "greater respect is due to Scripture than such as would allow us to transform its genuine meaning by this licence. Certainly it is clear to any man that these speculations go beyond the mind of Christ and that they are a device of curious men." Maldonatus interprets in a plain sense. He then adds: "Whether there be besides some mystical meaning, I will neither deny nor affirm, but since all the ancient Fathers have handed it down with general agreement, it is very probable that the parable contains not only allegory—in which indeed the Fathers have not all agreed—but also a mystical meaning which God instilled into the minds of all the Fathers." He then recounts the usual patristic exegesis. But he concludes with a warning against the attempt to find a symbolic meaning in all the details of a parable: "Multa enim dici in parabolis solere, non ut aliquid significetur, sed quia in re, in qua parabola consistit, ita fieri solet, itaque factum fuisse verisimile est."[1]

---

[1] Luther did not reckon the synoptic Gospels among the weightier parts of Scripture. Separate sayings and deeds of Jesus mattered less, in his view, than the direct proclamation of the Gospel in St. Paul. He placed the Gospel of St. John above the other Gospels.

In the seventeenth century the outstanding name among commentators upon the Gospels is that of Grotius (†1645). His notes on the Gospels were partly written during the period of his imprisonment (1619–21) and were completed at Paris after his escape. The controversial element, so prominent in the commentaries of the sixteenth century, now disappears. Grotius himself supported the Remonstrant revolt against Calvinism, but his chief purpose was to get behind the controversies of the Reformation epoch and work for the reunion of Christendom. With this purpose in view he deliberately refrains from referring to earlier commentators by name lest he should accentuate the existing divisions which he deplores. He declares that he accepts those interpretations of Holy Scripture which the Christian Churches have continuously accepted from the first age. In point of fact the traditional patristic exegesis does not figure very considerably in Grotius's brief yet learned comments on the Gospel text. He is first and foremost the pupil of J. J. Scaliger, and brings to bear upon the text the grammatical and philological methods which he learned from his master.

Hammond, "the Father of English commentators" (†1660), was a Royalist divine. Like Grotius he avoids the doctrinal controversies of the Reformation era, and at the same time seeks by the scholarly exegesis of Holy Scripture to escape the theological perils which beset the current claims to personal and individual inspiration. In his *Paraphrases and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament* (1653) he "purposely abstains from all doctrinal conclusions and deductions" as well as "from all postillary observations and accommodations, moral or mystical anagogies." He wishes his readers to supplement him if necessary from Grotius, "from whom, as oft as I had nothing to add, I purposely avoided to transcribe anything."

---

[1] Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *supra*, p. xxxv.

Two works which represent the exegetical labours of the first half of the eighteenth century have won a permanent place in the literature on the New Testament.

The *Gnomon* (1742) of Bengel (1687–1752), a Lutheran prelate in Würtemberg, is a masterpiece of terse and scholarly exposition on the whole of the New Testament.

J. J. Wettstein (1693–1754), professor at the Remonstrant College at Amsterdam, after being twice deprived of an ecclesiastical appointment at Basle on a charge of heterodoxy, made important contributions to the textual criticism of the New Testament (a subject which became prominent towards the end of the seventeenth century), and compiled a mass of material from classical and rabbinic sources illustrative of the text of the New Testament, of which all subsequent commentators down to the present day have made extensive use.

### (v.) From the Rise of the Critical Study of the Gospels

From the second century to the eighteenth the Gospel according to St. Luke had been a constituent part of an authoritative Canon of Scripture. Widely as different schools and different eras had differed in their method of exegesis, they were all alike concerned to interpret a given text of Scripture. The value and authority of the text were not seriously in question. The age of the Illumination questioned all things, and it questioned the idea of a collection of inspired writings. The old naïve acceptance of the authority of the Canon was weakened by Semler's historical researches into the early history of the Church, and it came to be realised that there was a time in Christian history when the Canon had not been. It was an inevitable further step to study the different books included in the Canon apart from presuppositions as to their inspiration and the authority which attached to them in virtue of their inclusion in the

Canon. The governing idea of the Canon which constituted these particular books as scripture was brought clearly into consciousness and, so far as method was concerned, definitely set on one side.

The new attitude is well expressed in the title of Lessing's small book on the Gospels, which may be regarded as the fountain source of modern Gospel criticism: *A New Hypothesis concerning the Evangelists, considered as purely Human Writers of History.*[1] Lessing recognised and stated the literary problem which was to engage the attention of critics during the next half-century. He saw that the similarities and differences between the synoptic Gospels called for some theory of their origin which allowed for literary relationship between them. Lessing held that the relationship was collateral. The canonical Gospels derive ultimately from an Aramaic Gospel which he identified with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. This he held was originally composed shortly after the death of Christ, and subsequently was subjected to some re-editing. Matthew, Mark, and Luke are independent translations into Greek of various forms of this original Gospel. Lessing's theory was in its main outline adopted by Eichorn.[2] An alternative hypothesis was put forward by Griesbach.[3] Following up the theory of Augustine,[4] that Mark was an abbreviation of Matthew, Griesbach held that an original Gospel was composed by Matthew in Greek. Luke depended upon Matthew, adding to Matthew material taken from oral tradition. Mark was an abbreviation of Matthew and Luke. Griesbach's theory of the secondary character of Mark is of importance in the history of criticism, since it was taken over both by Strauss in his *Life of Jesus* (1835) and by the Tübingen leader, F. C. Baur. Herder[5] looked for the original of the Gospels in an oral catechetical tradition, which, he supposed, extended from the Baptism of John to the

---

[1] *Neue Hypothese über die Evangelisten als bloss menschliche Geschichtschreiber betrachtet*, 1778, published 1784; *Sämtliche Werke. hrg. Göring*, Band 18, pp. 203 f.

[2] *Einleitung in d. N.T.*, 1804.

[3] *Commentatio qua Marci evangelium totum de Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur*, 1789–90.

[4] *De Consensu*, I. ii. 4 (Migne, *P.L.* xxxiv. 1041).

[5] *Regel der Zusammenstimmung unserer Evangelien aus ihrer Entstehung und Ordnung*, 1797. (*Werke*, Stuttgart u. Tübingen, 1830, *Zur Religion*, Band 17.)

Ascension and contained both narratives and discourse. This catechetical framework took shape in Palestine about A.D. 35–40. Mark represents a Greek version of this oral tradition. The same tradition was enlarged about A.D. 60 into the Aramaic Gospel of the Nazarenes, which in turn was the source both of Matthew and of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Luke he held to be dependent upon Palestinian tradition through the *αὐτοπταί* and *ὑπηρέται*, and upon the Aramaic Gospel. He accurately describes Luke's work as "the first Christian history." The Gospel is "no collection of Gospel stories, like Mark; no Jewish demonstrative argument, like Matthew. Luke wrote his history like a pure Greek."[1] Another theory as to the origin of the Gospels was put forward by Schleiermacher. In an essay on St. Luke's Gospel (1817)[2] he suggested that the synoptic Gospels were to be regarded as collections formed out of a number of small writings (*διηγήσεις*, Lk. i. 1-4). Schleiermacher later abandoned this theory,[3] and taking his start from the testimony of Papias adopted the hypothesis of Mark and the Logia as the two fundamental sources of the Gospels.

A new direction was given to the study of the Gospels by the Tübingen critics Baur and Schwegler. Approaching the problem from the side of Church history, they aimed at defining positively the place of the several Gospels in the process of development through which the Christian religion passed. The Tübingen School has exercised a lasting influence upon the subject in that it emphasised the necessity of considering the motives and circumstances of the evangelists and their relation to the developing life of the Church. But the actual view which they entertained of the course of history was too largely determined *a priori* by the Hegelian philosophy, and the particular critical theory which Baur maintained in his chief work[1] on the subject has totally collapsed.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 228.

[2] Schleiermacher's Essay on St. Luke was translated into English by Connop Thirlwall (1825). Previously to this Marsh had introduced the German criticism of the Gospels by his translation of Michaelis's *Introduction to the N.T.* (1793–1801), to which he added a Dissertation on the Four Gospels. But the English contribution to the criticism of the Gospels remained slight until towards the end of the last century, with the exception of Dr. E. A. Abbott's art. 'Gospels,' for the 9th edition of the *Ency. Brit.*

[3] *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832.

From the time of Semler attention had been directed afresh to the accounts in the Fathers of Marcion's Gospel, which, it was affirmed by the Fathers, had been constructed by mutilation of St. Luke. The Patristic testimonies concerning the Gospels were not always trustworthy, and the early critics were unwilling to accept the Patristic statements on Marcion's Gospel at their face value. It was suspected that Marcion's Gospel, instead of being a mutilated version of Luke, was in reality an earlier form of Gospel. This was one of the corner-stones of Baur's criticism. He held that the Lucan Gospel was an amplification of the Gospel of Marcion.[2] The other was that, with Griesbach, he held Mark to be derived from Matthew and Luke. The outcome of Baur's theory was that all the canonical Gospels were placed in the second century between the years 130 and 170. The earliest Gospel had been the Palestinian Gospel of Matthew, of which the Canonical Matthew was a later revision. Opposed to this was the Pauline Gospel used by Marcion, which had been later expanded and modified in an anti-Marcionite sense into the Canonical Luke. The Marcan Gospel, which was of a neutral character, had been based upon 'Matthew' and 'Luke.'

In the meantime order had been brought out of chaos in the literary problems as to the relation of the synoptic Gospels which had been first posed by Lessing, and the solution was not in the direction in which Baur was looking. In an article in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1835,[3] Lachmann, taking the text of the synoptic Gospels as they stand, made a comparison of the *order* of the sections common to the three evangelists in each of the Gospels. The comparison shewed that the differences between the Gospels in the order of these sections were less extensive than was commonly supposed, and that where differences occurred the order of either Matthew or Luke was invariably supported by Mark. In no case did Matthew and Luke agree in their order against Mark.

---

[1] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zu einander, ihren Character und Ursprung*, 1847.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 395, 424.

[3] *De ordine narrationum in evangeliis synopticis.*

The simplest hypothesis which satisfies these *data* is that the Gospels are interdependent and that Matthew and Luke each used and variously edited Mark. More detailed comparison of the Gospels in respect of language and wording shewed that here too the differences and resemblances group themselves in the same way. Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are on the whole inconspicuous, and the small residue which cannot easily be ascribed to accident have tended to diminish when the textual evidence is taken into account. In the most striking cases it is probable that textual assimilation has affected the existing text.[1]

We return, however, to the middle of the nineteenth century. The transposition of Mark to a position prior to Matthew and Luke, and the recognition that it was a source used in common by the other two synoptists, made havoc of Baur's scheme of the development of the early Church as represented in the supposed history of the Gospel literature. Even more fatal was the abandonment of the position that Marcion's Gospel was prior to canonical Luke. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar [2] maintained the priority of Luke, and Baur was himself convinced. In *The Gospels in the Second Century*, an early work (1876) of the late W. Sanday, pp. 222-230, the unity of style between the parts of Luke rejected by Marcion and those retained by him is triumphantly demonstrated by the impartial evidence of Bruder's *Concordance*. This was one of the first examples of a method which has had good results elsewhere.

From about the middle of the century the 'two source' hypothesis succeeded in establishing itself with various modifications among critics. It was generally agreed that Mark was the earliest of the extant Gospels, and it was also generally agreed that another written source (Q) lay behind the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. In some form or other these two conclusions have been worked into almost all the subsequent theories of the genesis of the synoptic Gospels, and there is to-day no disposition to retreat from the positions which Lachmann, C. G. Wilke, Weisse, and others secured.

---

[1] See the full discussion in Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pt. ii. chap. xi. 'The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark.'

[2] *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 1850.

It is not necessary to emphasise the importance of these conclusions. As against the Tübingen criticism there was a tendency to return to a position nearer tradition in respect of the date of the Gospels, and 'source criticism' seemed to shew that the Gospels when critically tested would yield a firm pathway by which men might reach beyond the evangelists to the historical Jesus. The discredit which had overtaken the Hegelian philosophy extended itself to the speculative interpretation of Christian history. The development of the Christian idea was neither an equivalent nor a substitute for faith in the historic Jesus Christ. In spite of the 'mythical' theory of Strauss, and in spite of Tübingen, the lineaments of a historic figure might still be recovered from the Gospel texts by scientific research.[1] On the other hand, as against tradition, criticism had worked through to definite conclusions which made it no longer possible to regard the Gospels as being in the main independent and co-ordinate authorities giving direct, or almost direct, apostolic testimony to the life and teaching of Jesus. The Gospel of Matthew, according to tradition the earliest Gospel and the work of an apostle, was now seen to be a secondary work dependent upon another Gospel, itself but the work of an apostle's disciple. Similarly the Lucan Gospel was another edition of the same work. During the second half of the nineteenth century the new critical perspective tended to impose itself upon the minds of scholars. The principal works on St. Luke's Gospel from now onwards are generally conditioned by acceptance in some form of the new critical hypothesis, though in some cases with considerable modifications. Thus Renan in the *Vie de Jésus* (1st ed. 1863) held the third Gospel to have been written shortly after 70 probably by Luke the disciple of St. Paul, and to be dependent upon earlier editions of Matthew and of Mark. But in *Les Évangiles* (1877) he held Luke to be dependent upon an edition of Mark, which differed but slightly from the canonical form, and to be independent of Matthew; Luke also drew upon other sources both oral and documentary—perhaps a Greek translation of a Hebrew Protevangelium—and added some inventions of his own. Renan still dated the Gospel shortly after 70, and supposed it to have been written at Rome ; whereas Matthew and Mark are neutral in the controversies which agitated the Church, Luke, according to Renan, was an adherent of the Pauline policy and held views which were in entire conformity with those of Paul.

---

[1] Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien* (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 418 f.

The two source theory leaves open a number of questions, two of which are of especial importance. (1) What is the relation, if any, between Mark and Q ? (2) What is the origin and value of the material peculiar to the Lucan Gospel ? On the latter question there has been much speculation. B. Weiss, *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums* (1907) (resuming the arguments of earlier works), held that besides Mark and Q Luke depended upon another single source of Palestinian origin containing both discourses and narratives which betrayed affinities with the Johannine tradition. P. Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte* (1891), argued for a synoptic *Grundschrift* prior to all the synoptic Gospels. Mark represents an amplification of this document. Matthew depended upon the *Grundschrift*, not upon Mark. Luke used Mark, the *Grundschrift*, and a special document in which the Q material was already combined with narratives and parables peculiar to the Gospel. Spitta, *Die synoptische Grundschrift in ihrer Überlieferung durch das Lukasevangelium*, 1912, argued that Luke had used mainly two sources—Q and a *Grundschrift* which was also the foundation of Mark and Matthew. The *Grundschrift*, he held, was most truly represented by the narrative part of Luke. These hypotheses, so far as they concern the relation of Matthew and Luke to a supposed *Grundschrift* prior to Mark, have failed to establish themselves, but the hypothesis of a ' Proto-Luke ' somewhat similar to Feine's theory referred to above has been recently put forward in England by Streeter [1] and developed by Taylor.[2]

Loisy, *L'Évangile selon Luc* (1924), attempts to distinguish between the present Gospel which he holds to be dependent upon St. Matthew and St. John (or possibly precanonical forms of these Gospels), assigning it provisionally to a date between 125 and 150, and the original work of the *auctor ad Theophilum*. The latter, he thinks, was probably written about 80, and he sees no reason to question that the author was Luke, the companion of St. Paul. He conjectures tentatively that the original Gospel may have started, like Marcion's Gospel, with the preaching of Jesus at Capernaum and the call of the first disciples, being dependent upon a supposed precanonical form of Mark which Luke preferred to the canonical form of the Gospel—if indeed Luke knew the canonical form at all. Loisy apparently thinks of reopening the question of the relation of the Lucan Gospel to the Gospel of Marcion. "The relation of our Gospel," he writes, "with that of Marcion may be less simple than is commonly supposed" (p. 62). But the hint is not developed further. Loisy's theory of the Gospel is really a pendant to his theory of the composition of Acts, and to do it justice it would be necessary to discuss the problems of Acts at length. In the meantime we may notice that the linguistic unity of the books is a grave objection to these attempts to distinguish editions. Moreover, there seems to be no sufficient support for the conjecture that Marcion's Gospel in omitting the Mission of John the Baptist and his baptism of Jesus really represented a more primitive type of Gospel than the canonical Gospels. Given Marcion's theology, it was inevitable that he should rule out the sections on John the Baptist. But there seems no reason why Luke should have shrunk from including them about the year 80: by that time we may assume with some confidence that both Mark and Q, each with a prefatory account of John's Mission, were already in free circulation, and Luke would naturally follow his predecessors in this respect.

---

[1] *The Four Gospels*, chap. viii., developing the argument of an article in *The Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1921.

[2] *Behind the Third Gospel*, 1926.

We may now conclude this survey by noting certain tendencies in recent criticism which appear to be modifying the general approach to the Gospels, and which are raising questions somewhat different from the quest for 'sources' which was a natural sequel of the successful solution of the literary problem of the relations of the synoptic Gospels.

It had always been recognised that behind the written Gospels there lay a period of oral tradition concerning the life and work of Jesus. Herder, as we have seen, had laid emphasis upon the oral character of the earliest tradition, though he conceived that this tradition had taken substantially the form of the later Gospel at a very early date. But the successful proof that the natural divergence of oral tradition was not the *vera causa* for the actual differences and resemblances between the synoptic Gospels naturally tended to concentrate the interest of criticism upon the task of reconstructing the documents which might be supposed to lie behind the canonical Gospels. The ideal of criticism was conceived, perhaps half unconsciously, as the recovery and historical valuation of early sources for the life of Jesus. The 'Marcan hypothesis' generally held by critical writers on the life of Jesus started from the observation that the Marcan Gospel gives a sequence of narrative in which it seems possible to trace a certain development of plot. The intrigues against Jesus grow more menacing as the story proceeds, while on the other hand Jesus, after a period of public teaching, withdraws with his apostles into privacy and devotes himself to their private instruction, until at the end he once again appears on the public scene only to end his career on Golgotha. Though this framework is presupposed both in Matthew and Luke, it is to some extent distorted in those Gospels by rearrangement of the sections and by the intrusion of other matter, which other matter could often be shewn, both by source criticism and internal criticism, to be historically out of place where it stood. The 'Marcan hypothesis' held that the Marcan view of the history was essentially the true historical view and passed judgement on the other Gospels as historical documents in the light of the evidence of Mark. But the hypothesis has itself been much weakened by criticism. Wrede's forceful interpretation of Mark found the Gospel dominated by the dogmatic and quite unhistorical idea of 'the Messianic secret'[1] which had been superimposed by the evangelist upon his materials. In reality, Wrede held, belief in the Messiahship of Jesus did not arise until after the death of Jesus. It was a deduction by the Church from their faith in the Resurrection. Wrede's criticism has, in its turn, been criticised. Johannes Weiss, in particular, has shewn the difficulty of deriving belief in the Messiahship from the Resurrection faith unless that idea of the person of Jesus had been already entertained while Jesus was preaching and teaching. The Resurrection would confirm, but it could not originate, the idea that Jesus was Messiah. What concerns us here to note is that Wrede succeeded in making it plausible to regard the structural unity of Mark as the creation of the evangelist rather than as a *datum* of tradition. Moreover, the historical connexions which the 'Marcan hypothesis' found in Mark were often indicated but imperfectly, if at all, and the question presented itself whether the development of the plot was not rather a postulate of the hypothesis than an inference from the evidence. In a broad sense the Marcan Gospel, as even Wrede admitted, gave a true perspective: Jesus first appeared in Galilee with his message of the approach of the kingdom of God, and ultimately died as a malefactor at Jerusalem, as Mark narrates, but the order of the events and the disposition of the material in Mark were probably dictated rather by motives of literary suitability and convenience than of fidelity to a tradition. It is indeed the connexions between the sections which are often most clearly of a secondary character and which betray the editorial work of a writer who is combining separate materials from different sources.[1] The parts existed before the whole. The composite character of the Marcan Gospel is particularly evident in the two narratives of the feeding of the multitude. These are fairly clearly literary doublets, and there is good reason for suspecting that the surrounding sections are also parts of variant versions of the same cycle of stories. On the 'Marcan hypothesis' this is a serious admission.

---

[1] *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901.

But the chief consideration which has told against the 'Marcan hypothesis' is the inherent improbability of the supposition that a *connected* tradition of the history of the life had been transmitted across the thirty or forty eventful years which intervened between the Crucifixion and the writing of Mark. Memories and impressions, incidents, and above all sayings and teachings, would be recalled and recorded, but of a biographical interest in the

[1] See K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, Berlin, 1919, and Dr. Rawlinson's edition of St. Mark, *passim*.

development of the earthly life of Jesus at this period we have no evidence, and it is improbable that such an interest existed.

The literary study of the Gospels did not raise these questions vividly. The tendency was to discount as far as possible the editorial element in the late stages of the literary tradition where it could be tested by comparative study and thus to try to restore a more or less reliable original. This method of regress to earlier sources had, and has, its very plain justification, but it is essential to recognise from the outset what are its limitations. These are twofold. (1) Jesus himself wrote nothing. (2) It may be safely assumed that his simple and unlettered disciples did not commit his teaching to writing at the time. It follows that, as we get further back, the *literary* evidence will grow more and more meagre, and if we could get back to the beginnings it would disappear. There is nothing here to correspond to the literary nucleus of authentic writings which, to all time, will represent the person and the preaching of the apostle Paul. At the time of the Crucifixion a body of men and women were in possession of memories and impressions of what Jesus had said and done, of what he had been to them and to others. Those memories were charged afresh by the faith in the Resurrection. The unattainable ideal of Gospel criticism is first to reconstruct the process by which those memories and impressions of the first disciples were transformed and translated within the Christian society into narratives and discourses, and then to trace the process of literary consolidation which welded the traditional material into literary wholes. The probable extent of the contribution of individual memories should not be estimated too low. During the first generation after the Crucifixion there must have been a not inconsiderable number of persons in the churches who had themselves seen and heard the Lord. Pre-eminent among these would be the apostle Peter himself. Their personal recollections would be especially valued, and their presence in the community would be a check on the development of tradition. Yet the all-important consideration remains that the traditions about Jesus lived in the *milieu* of a society which was constituted by its faith in him as Christ and Lord. The faith, the needs, the difficulties, internal and external, of the community have played an essential part in the creation of the literature. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, the title of Bultmann's chief book on the criticism of the Gospels, describes accurately the task of criticism as it appears now to present itself. Unconvincing in detail as Bultmann often appears to be, his book is perhaps the most important study of the Gospels of recent years, since it attempts to analyse and classify the whole body of material contained in the synoptic Gospels, and to shew how in their expansion and development the different types of narrative and discourse may be related to the life, needs, and interests of the growing Church. This close interdependence of our records of the life of Jesus and popular tradition must condition our appreciation of their value. The literature is the creation of a historical community grouped around a concrete individual personality. On the one hand it must be recognised that accurate investigation of fact would be alien to the ideas and interests of such a society as the most primitive Church. On the other hand a popular literature is uniquely fitted to convey truthful characterisation. The communal mind will feel, resent, and reject the inappropriate.[1] Thus in the Gospels the character and spirit of John the Baptist and of Jesus Christ are each of them conveyed with inimitable because unconscious skill.[2]

The Gospel according to St. Luke to some extent stands by itself. The Preface shews a sense of conscious and critical authorship. But the Preface must not be pressed too far. The body of the Gospel shews that the author was throughout dependent upon the tradition as it had already shaped itself. Luke never really gets behind Mark, though at times he appears to criticise Mark's history. Luke was inevitably mastered by the only material that was available, and of all the Gospels Luke is richest in material which enables us to distinguish different *genres* in narrative and discourse which the tradition of the words and works of Jesus assumed in different circles and at different times.

---

[1] Cf. J. Weiss, *Die drei älteren Evangelien*, p. 44.

[2] It seems to me to be a weakness in Bultmann's work that he often fails to do justice to this truth of the Gospels in characterisation. Cf. pp. 47, 244 *infra*.

## III

# THE COMPOSITION AND THE SOURCES OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

THE first Gospel, like the third, cannot be exactly dated, but, like the third, it certainly falls in the generation which followed the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Neither Gospel is dependent upon the other,[1] and it is very likely that the two are almost contemporary. Early in the second century, at the time of Ignatius, St. Matthew appears to have been the official Gospel of the Church of Antioch, and it was perhaps composed in that Church somewhere between the years 80 and 90. Luke was perhaps written about the same time by a Gentile Christian resident in Rome. Different as the two Gospels are in tone and in general treatment, the resemblances are even more striking. Each evangelist has based his work upon the same Marcan Gospel. Each evangelist has incorporated with Mark the same collection of sayings and discourses (Q). Each evangelist has prefixed to the Marcan story narratives concerning the birth of Jesus Christ. Each evangelist has completed the Marcan story at the end with accounts of appearances of the risen Christ and of the commission of Christ to the Apostles to evangelise the world. Each evangelist interpolates a genealogy of the Lord. It may be presumed that each was influenced by the same popular sensitiveness to certain inadequacies of the Marcan Gospel and the same desire to consolidate the tradition in a definitive form. Matthew and Luke may be regarded as variant types of the same definitive form in which the tradition of the words and works of Jesus Christ ultimately came to rest. When the Church in the second century gradually felt its way to the recognition of an authoritative Gospel Canon, these two Gospels with their predecessor Mark came to be accepted as normative for the whole Church. No further revising or editing of the tradition had been found necessary. The Fourth member of the Canon—the Gospel according to St. John—was indeed later in date. But St. John's Gospel represents a recasting of the tradition under new impulses rather than a consolidation and expansion of traditional material. The distinction between St. John and the synoptists is not indeed absolute. There are approximations to a Johannine standpoint in the synoptists, and in St. John the traditional material is integral to the book. But in the main the distinction holds that whereas St. John's Gospel stands apart as an original creation, St. Matthew and St. Luke are best regarded as the last terms in a long process of literary evolution.

---

[1] Both Gospels have amplified the Marcan Passion narrative, but their additions coincide at no point. The Birth stories in the two Gospels shew no signs of contact, and the treatment both of Mark and Q is independent. "Subsequent to the Temptation story, there is not a single case in which Matthew and Luke agree in inserting the same saying (from Q) at the same point in the Marcan outline. If, then, Luke derived this material from Matthew, he must have gone through both Matthew and Mark so as to discriminate with meticulous precision between Marcan and non-Marcan material; he must then have proceeded with the utmost care to tear every little piece of non-Marcan material he desired to use from the context of Mark in which it appeared in Matthew—in spite of the fact that contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate—in order to re-insert it into a different context of Mark, having no special appropriateness" (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 183).

The Gospel according to St. Luke is built upon a fairly clear external plan :

i., ii. The Infancy and Childhood of John the Baptist and of Jesus.
iii.-iv. 13. The Mission of John. His Baptism of Jesus. The Temptation of Jesus.
iv. 14-ix. 50. The Ministry of Jesus in Galilee.
ix. 51-xix. 48. The journey of Jesus and his disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem.
xx.-xxiv. The last days in Jerusalem. The Crucifixion. The Appearances of the risen Lord.

This plan has been taken over from St. Mark, and the non-Marcan material has been built into the Marcan framework.[1] There is an extension at the beginning, an extension at the end, and two considerable interpolations in the middle. The Galilean ministry is enriched with the Sermon on the Plain, the healing of the Centurion's servant, the raising of the widow's son at Nain, the messengers of John, the anointing of Jesus by a woman. The other additional matter is thrown for the most part into the journey from the North to the South, which in Mark is related without any detail.

The greater part of the Marcan Gospel is incorporated in Luke. With a few exceptions the Marcan order is reproduced, and except in the narratives of the Passion and Resurrection, which stand by themselves, the greater number of the smaller changes may be brought under the heads of (1) abbreviation, (2) improvement of the wording.

A certain number of Marcan sections are omitted because Luke has parallel narratives from another source, and he wishes to avoid duplication. Thus (1) Mark's version of the call of Simon, Andrew, James, and John (i. 16-20) is omitted and replaced by a variant version, which is inserted at a somewhat later point in the Marcan order (Luke v. 1 f.).

---

[1] Streeter, on the other hand, suggests that the non-Marcan sections of the Gospel—'Proto-Luke'—should be regarded as the fundamental document, into which the Marcan material has been 'interpolated' at a later stage. I dissent from this suggestion, primarily because, whereas Mark appears to give a clue to the disposition of 'Proto-Luke' in the existing Gospel, the subtraction of Marcan material leaves an amorphous collection of narrative and discourse the greater part of which is thrown without intelligible reason into the unsuitable form of a 'travel document' (ix. 52-xviii.). Moreover, signs of the use of Mark are clear both in the account of John's mission (iii. 3 and prob. also iii. 16) and above all in the Passion narratives. In the latter not only are there complete sections which are unmistakably taken from Mark (e.g. xxii. 7-13, 54-61), but Marcan phrases appear in the middle of sections which in other respects differ considerably from Mark (see e.g. xxii. 19a, 22, 47, 52, 71; xxiii. 3). These signs of Mark are intelligible if the Lucan narrative is a recasting and expansion of the Marcan text. If, however, Luke had already written or found a full and independent non-Marcan narrative, it seems unlikely that afterwards he would have interpolated occasional sentences and verses from Mark (see below, p. lxiv). It appears to me, therefore, that Mark must be regarded as a determining factor in the construction of the existing book from the outset. This, however, is not necessarily inconsistent with the hypothesis that Q and some of Luke's peculiar material may have been already combined, and may have lain before Luke as a single document. Cf. below, p. lxxv.

(2) The controversy on casting out devils by Beelzebub (Mk. iii. 22-30) is omitted at the corresponding place in Luke, but is replaced by a similar narrative (from Q) at xi. 14-22. Similarly the saying concerning blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in the same Marcan context is represented by a variant at xii. 10b.

(3) The parable of the Mustard Seed (Mk. iv. 30-32) is omitted at Lk. viii., but a variant version (from Q) appears at xiii. 18, 19. (The parable of 'the seed growing secretly' which in Mark makes a pair with 'the mustard seed' has also dropped out. In Lk. xiii., as in Mt. xiii., the parable of the leaven is paired with the mustard seed.)

(4) Mark's narrative of the visit to Nazareth (vi. 1-6) is omitted and replaced by a longer variant which stands as an introductory scene to the whole story of the ministry (Luke iv. 16 f.).

(5) The question of the Scribe (Mk. xii. 28-34) is omitted at Lk. xx. The preface to the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 25) had already provided an alternative.

(6) The anointing of Jesus by a woman at Bethany (Mk. xiv. 3-9) is omitted. But a similar story had already been incorporated at vii. 36 f.

Other omissions find partial parallels in non-Marcan material. Thus the question of divorce raised by the omitted narrative of Mk. x. 1-12 is dealt with in the single verse xvi. 18. The story of the request of the sons of Zebedee (Mk. x. 35 f.) may perhaps have been distasteful to the evangelist on other grounds (see below, p. lxiii), but there is a counterpart to the subsequent sayings of Jesus in the Lucan version of the Supper (*c.* xxii.). The story of the execution of John the Baptist (Mk. vi. 17 f., omitted at Lk. ix. 9) was perhaps felt to be an interruption of the narrative, and Luke may also have been critical of it on historical grounds. The withering of the fig tree (Mk. xi. 12-14, 20-25) was almost certainly a part of Luke's text of Mark (cf. Lk. xvii. 6 n.), but probably did not appear worthy of inclusion.

Besides other minor editorial omissions from Mark, there is one long section omitted from Mark which calls for further notice. At ix. 17 Luke passes direct from Mk. vi. 44 (the feeding of the five thousand) to viii. 26 (the confession of Peter), thus omitting:

Mk. vi. 45-52. Jesus walks on the sea.
53-56. Healing at Gennesaret.
vii. 1-23. Controversy with the Pharisees on the Jewish regulations concerning defilement.
24-30. Journey to the districts of Tyre. The Syrophenician's daughter healed.
31-37. Healing of a deaf man in Decapolis.
viii. 1-10. Feeding of four thousand.
11-13. Pharisees seek a sign.
14-21. Discourse on the boat concerning the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod and concerning the two feedings of the multitudes.
22-26. The healing of a blind man at Bethsaida.

It has been supposed that the explanation of this omission is that Luke read an edition of Mark which did not contain the omitted sections,[1] and that the Lucan Gospel thus affords evidence as to an earlier form of St. Mark. But as we have no other weighty grounds for supposing that Luke used Mark in a form essentially different from that which we possess, it is reasonable to consider motives which, on the hypothesis that Luke knew the present form of Mark, may be supposed to have influenced him in making the omission.

First, however, an objection to the conjecture derived from the internal criticism of Mark calls for notice. It is a reasonable supposition that Mark has incorporated two variant versions of the same cycle of events each beginning with an account of the feeding of the multitude: Mk. vi. 30-vii. 37 and viii. 1-26. If this surmise is well founded, it tells against the theory that an earlier form of Mark corresponded to the Lucan sequence of Marcan material, for this supposition requires us to break into one of the two conjectural complexes of Marcan narrative.

---

[1] Stanton (*G.H.D.* ii. p. 156) thinks that some of the omitted sections were not present in Luke's edition of Mark, but that others (vii. 24-37, viii. 11-13, 15, 22-26) must always have been part of Mark. The reasons assigned for questioning the remaining sections are not in themselves decisive, and Stanton's hypothesis does not materially ease the problem from which the discussion sets out, viz. why did Luke make omissions? If we may suppose that Luke read and omitted Mk. vii. 24-37 etc., it seems equally easy and more satisfactory to suppose that he read all the sections and omitted them all.

It may be added that Luke himself probably betrays acquaintance with what he has omitted by his interpolated reference to Bethsaida at ix. 10. Cf. Mark vi. 45.

A combination of motives may have influenced Luke's procedure. The Gospel as it stands would have made a long roll—Kenyon estimates the length at about 30 or 31 feet—and Luke may have found it necessary to exercise economy in the use of his material. Moreover, Luke clearly avoids doublets. His critical instinct will have taught him to regard the feeding of the four thousand and the feeding of the five thousand as doublets. The omission of viii. 1-10 would require a drastic re-writing of *vv.* 14-21. It would be easier to sacrifice the latter section, especially as the meaning of the text is obscure. (It may be noted that Lk. xii. 1, which has no counterpart in the corresponding text of Mt. x. 26 f., perhaps shews acquaintance with Mk. viii. 15.) There is a parallel to Mk. viii. 11-13 in Lk. xi. 16, 29. The healing of the blind man, Mk. viii. 22-26, is effected with apparent difficulty, and for this reason may not have commended itself to Luke. The same may be said of the similar story of the healing of the dumb man, vii. 31-37, which precedes the feeding of the four thousand.[1] In Mk. vii. 24-30, *v.* 27 could not fail to be a stumbling-block to the evangelist and his Gentile public. vii. 1-23 may well have seemed to be lacking in relevance for Gentile readers. vi. 45-52 might be treated as a duplicate of Lk. viii. 22-25 ( = Mk. iv. 35-41). vi. 53-56 adds little to what has been already narrated elsewhere. For some such reasons as these Luke may have felt that he was sacrificing little of value by this extensive omission from his source.

An examination of Luke's treatment of the Marcan text shews him to have carried through a drastic revision of the language. The characteristic Marcan idioms are obliterated, and the whole narrative is made smoother and more consecutive. Thus adverbial πολλά and adverbial εὐθύς[2] are entirely eliminated from the Marcan sections.

---

[1] Both these miracles are also omitted by Matthew.

[2] εὐθύς occurs once only in Luke (vi. 49) and that in a non-Marcan setting.

With one exception (viii. 49) the Marcan historic present is everywhere transposed into an imperfect or an aorist.[1] He also regularly eases the connexion between a fresh paragraph and its predecessor by the introduction of some vague note of time or place,[2] and very frequently opens a paragraph with the Biblical ἐγένετο δέ.[3] On the other hand, from a historical point of view, he is on the whole conservative in his treatment of the substance of his material. He frequently abbreviates, omitting detail which might seem irrelevant (e.g. in *c.* iii. particulars about the Baptist's mode of life), and in so doing he occasionally obscures the course of the story (see notes on *c.* viii., the raising of Jairus's daughter). He has no scruple in transposing (e.g. vi. 12 f., viii. 19, xviii. 35) or fusing recorded events (e.g. xix. 45) if by so doing he will improve the literary connexion or the dramatic setting. Again, a tendency which became more pronounced in the later forms of the Gospel story, particularly in St. John, to identify speakers and subordinate figures in the tradition is also to be noticed in St. Luke. Thus at viii. 45 a question is assigned to Peter which in Mark is ascribed vaguely to the disciples. At xxii. 8 the two unnamed disciples of Mark xiv. who go to make the preparations for the supper are identified as Peter and John. On the other hand, at xxi. 7 the names of the four questioners which are given in Mk. xiii. 3 disappear. (See notes *ad loc.*)

Other motives may probably be traced in Luke's editorial procedure. A sense of reverence for the person of Jesus leads him to tone down Marcan phrases which ascribe sternness or apparent harshness to the Lord (cf. Lk. v. 14 with Mk. i. 43; Lk. vi. 10 with Mk. iii. 5). He emphasises the Lord's instinctive knowledge of men (vi. 8, cf. Mk. iii. 3). For a similar reason he omits from Mark (iii. 19-21) the statement that his family thought him mad. He also omits the cry from the cross, "Eloi, Eloi . . ." A certain devout psychological interest leads him to note, without authority from his source, that Jesus was praying when the Spirit descended upon him after his baptism, and again when he was transfigured in the mountain. Reverence for members of the apostolic college is probably responsible for the omission of the rebuke of Peter after his confession of the Messiahship, and also for the omission of the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee. Perhaps for a similar reason at viii. 10 he omits from Mk. iv. 13 the words *καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;* with their implied rebuke. Again, in the account of the storm on the sea (viii. 22 f.), the impatient plaint of the apostles in Mark is toned down to a simple appeal, and in the response of Jesus the Marcan words *τί δειλοί ἐστε;* drop out. In the scene in the garden Luke explains, without Marcan authority, that the disciples were sleeping 'for grief.' And after the arrest he forbears to record that the disciples 'forsook him and fled.'

---

[1] Sir John Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*,² pp. 143 f.) finds a total of 4 historic presents in narrative in St. Luke, viz. (besides viii. 49) vii. 40, xi. 37, 45 [add xxiv. 12 and 36 in agreement with John in 'Western non-interpolations']. Also 4 in parables: xiii. 8, xvi. 7, 29, xix. 22. Acts gives 13 historic presents. Against this are to be set, in Matthew, 78 historic presents in narrative and 15 in parables; and in Mark 151 in narrative, none in parables.

[2] E.g. v. 12, 17, 27; vi. 6, 12, etc.

[3] See note on i. 8.

The words of Jesus are generally reproduced without material change. But on occasion a new idea is introduced which is not present in the source. (Compare Lk. v. 36 with Mk. ii. 21, and see notes *ad loc.*) The parable of the Sower affords a good illustration of Luke's method of compression and elucidation, and the interpretation of the same parable shews a tendency to interpolate the more or less conventional language of Church piety into his source.

In his account of the Passion and Resurrection Luke has treated the Marcan source with greater freedom than elsewhere. Not only does he appear to re-write freely, but, assuming Mark to be his source, he has transposed the order of a number of incidents and paragraphs. These phenomena lend the chief support to the theories of Feine, Streeter, and others that Luke has here followed some other continuous source which, in the main, he has preferred to Mark. It is argued in the special introductions and notes on these chapters that it is, on the whole, easier to assume that here too Mark has provided the foundation of the story. The additional matter in general seems to be secondary. The rearrangements are more extensive, but not essentially different from what is found elsewhere. If Luke wished to expand the narrative of the Last Supper, it would be not unnatural to throw the distribution of the bread and wine to the beginning, and to group together conversation and discourse at the close. Again, Luke has seen the inconsistency implied in Mark's statement that objection was raised to effecting the arrest on the night of the feast when compared with the following narrative, and he was probably also alive to the unlikelihood of a full meeting of the Sanhedrin late on the night of the Passover. Luke's own historical criticism may thus be held to account for the chief transpositions in the narrative of the events subsequent to the arrest. And the outstanding consideration remains that at crucial points the Marcan source unmistakably shews through.[1] (See above, p. lviii. n.)

Comparison of the third Gospel with the first shews that Matthew and Luke used in common another Greek source (Q) which consisted mainly, but not exclusively, of sayings and discourse. The exact extent and the exact wording of this lost document must remain conjectural. It is of course possible that certain passages, though represented in one only of the two Gospels, are nevertheless derived from Q. The following sections in Luke may be ascribed with some certainty to this lost document:

| | |
|---|---|
| iii. 7-9, 16-17. | The preaching of John. |
| iv. 1-13. | The temptation of Jesus. |
| vi. 20-49. | The great sermon. |
| vii. 1-10. | The healing of the centurion's servant. |
| 18-34. | Discourse on John the Baptist. |
| ix. 57-60. | Two would-be disciples. |
| x. 2-16. | Charge to the seventy disciples. |

---

[1] Cf. the following judgement by Sir John Hawkins (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 90): "The well-known theory of Feine and others that Luke had before him some kind of record, or early Gospel, which he used as a third source, in addition to, and frequently in preference to, Mark and the *Logia*, at once suggests itself. And I used to think that the strongest arguments in favour of that theory were to be found in his Passion-narrative. But the closer investigation, of which I have been here summarising the results, has impressed upon me that such a 'three-document hypothesis,' as it may be called, does not give much help towards the interpretation of the phenomena here presented to us. *Luke's additions are (unlike Matthew's) so mixed up with the* Grundschrift, *and they have caused alterations and modifications of such kinds, that they suggest a long and gradual conflation in the mind rather than a simple conflation by the pen.*" (Italics mine.)

x. 21-24. Thanksgiving to the Father, and benediction upon the disciples.
xi. 2-4, 9-13. On prayer.
14-26. On casting out devils.
29-35. On granting a sign, and other sayings.
39-52. Woes on Pharisees.
xii. 2-10. Fear nought save God, and other sayings.
22-34. Be not anxious.
39-46. Watch.
51-53. I am not come to send peace.
58-59. Agree with thine adversary.
xiii. 24. The narrow door.
28-29. They shall come from the East and the West.
34-35. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem!
xiv. 16-24. The great Supper.
26-27. On discipleship.
34-35. Salt is good.
xv. 4-6. The lost sheep.
xvi. 13. No man can serve two masters.
16-18. Sayings on the law.
xvii. 22-37 (or parts). On the revelation of the Son of Man.
xix. 11-27. The parable of the pounds.
xxii. 30. The judges of the twelve tribes.

Matthew has fitted in the Q material at suitable points in the Marcan narrative, freely transposing and combining his sources. Luke's procedure is different. He follows Mark continuously for long stretches, and interpolates non-Marcan material in blocks. It is reasonable to conjecture that Luke has, on the whole, preserved the original order of Q, as he has, on the whole, preserved the original order of Mark. Yet Luke's tendency to group together discourses which have some point of contact (e.g. in *c.* xiv.) may have disturbed the order of the source. The greater part of the Q material falls in the central section of the Gospel.

It is hard to make any general statement as to the modifications introduced by the two evangelists. Sometimes one, sometimes the other, seems to have retained more closely the phrasing of the source. On the whole Luke's version is perhaps the closer to the original. "It is fresher and less biblical" (Wellhausen). On the other hand, here too we can detect, by a comparison with Matthew, the occasional insertion of a theological term from the vocabulary of the Church into a saying of the Lord (cf. Lk. xi. 13 with Mt. vii. 11, Lk. xi. 42 with Mt. xxiii. 23). On occasion, too, Luke seems to re-write an obscure saying which Matthew has treated in a more conservative manner (cf. Lk. xvi. 16 with Mt. xi. 12). Again, in improving the structure of a Greek sentence Luke seems not infrequently to be insensible to a parallelism in the thought and phraseology of his source which has been preserved by Matthew.

The resemblances between Matthew and Luke are often so close (e.g. in the account of the preaching of John, and of the visit of the messengers of John with the subsequent sayings) that there is no room for doubt that a single Greek source lies behind the two Gospels. But differences elsewhere are sufficiently striking to make it probable that it lay before the evangelists in somewhat different versions. Matthew has freely conflated Q with discourse material from Mark and from other sources. Luke conflates less, but he too appears to be not entirely a stranger to this method of composition (cf. e.g. xvii. 20 f. with notes).

Besides the Marcan material and Q there is a large body of narrative and discourse peculiar to the third evangelist, as to the origin of which we are reduced to conjecture. A certain measure of literary creation may be plausibly ascribed to the evangelist himself. Possibly, for example, iii. 10-14 (the Baptist and his questioners), parts of iv. 16 f. (the Sermon at Nazareth), xix. 41-44 (the lament of Jesus over the city), a great part of xxiv. 13-32 (the journey to Emmaus), and probably the whole of xxiv. 44-end may be set to the account of Luke. But he certainly had other *literary* material at his command besides Mark and Q.

The following are the chief passages peculiar to the third Gospel:

| | |
|---|---|
| i., ii. | Narratives of the birth and infancy of John and Jesus. |
| iii. 10-14. | Questions to the Baptist. |
| iv. 14-30. | Sermon at Nazareth. |
| v. 1-11. | Call of Peter. |
| vi. 24-26. | Woes on the rich and the happy. |
| vii. 11-17. | The son of the widow of Nain. |
| 36-50. | Jesus anointed by a woman at the house of a Pharisee. |
| viii. 1-3. | Women who followed Jesus. |

ix. 51-56. Rejection by a Samaritan village.
61-62. "Suffer me to say farewell."
x. 17-20. The return of the seventy.
25-37. The Good Samaritan.
38-42. Martha and Mary.
xi. 5-8. The importunate friend.
27-28. Blessing on the mother of Jesus.
xii. 13-21. The parable of the Rich Fool.
35-38. "Let your loins be girded."
47-48. Few stripes and many stripes.
49-50. "I came to cast fire on the earth."
54-57. The face of the heaven and the signs of the times.
xiii. 1-5. Galileans murdered by Pilate; the fall of a tower in Siloam.
6-9. Parable of the Fig Tree.
10-17. Woman healed on the Sabbath day.
31-33. "Go hence, for Herod seeks to slay thee."
xiv. 1-6. Dropsical man healed on the Sabbath.
7-11. On taking the lowest seat.
12-14. Invite the poor.
28-33. Parables: on building a tower; on going to war.
xv. 8-10. Parable of the lost coin.
11-30. Parable of the two sons.
xvi. 1-12. Parable of the unjust steward, and following sayings.
19-31. Dives and Lazarus.
xvii. 7-10. A lord and his servant.
11-19. Ten lepers healed.
20-22, 28-31. Sayings on the sudden coming of the Son of Man.
xviii. 1-8. Parable of the unrighteous judge.
9-14. The Pharisee and the Publican.
xix. 1-10. Zacchaeus.
41-44. Jesus weeps over the city.
xxii. 1-28 (parts). Sayings at the Last Supper.
xxiii. 5-12. Jesus before Herod.
26-32. The weeping women.
39-43. The penitent thief.
xxiv. 13-35. The appearance on the way to Emmaus.
36-43. Jesus appears to the disciples at Jerusalem and eats before them.
44-53. The parting at Bethany.

It is perhaps improbable that Luke derived the whole of this heterogeneous body of material from a single source. The birth narratives certainly stand apart with distinct characteristics of their own. For the rest we may note certain salient features common to several of the sections.

There is a group of narratives more or less parallel to narratives in Mark. In some cases, as we have already noted, these have been allowed to replace Marcan parallels. In other cases (e.g. healings on the Sabbath, xiii., xiv., cf. vi. 6 f.; Jesus the guest of a publican, xix., cf. v. 29 f.; the healing of lepers, xvii., cf. v. 12 f.) the Marcan counterparts are not disturbed. The welcome accorded by Jesus to the penitent outcast in contrast with the neglect or contempt of the more respectable professors of religion is a theme which recurs. That Jesus came to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance is already told us in Mark. But Mark gives us no concrete presentation of the penitent publicans and sinners: the publican Levi answers the call to follow Jesus, but the Marcan narrative does not enter into the circumstances or the sentiments of the converted man. Contrast with this the Lucan story of Zacchaeus (*c.* xix.). Again, the woman who anoints Jesus appears both in Mark and in the special Lucan material. But in Luke she is a prostitute, and her devotion is presented as a foil to the neglect of the Pharisee who is Jesus' host. The *pericope de adultera* which finds a place in the MS. tradition of St. John's Gospel (and, in the Ferrar group of MSS., in Luke *c.* xxi.) is strikingly similar in tone and colouring, and may well have come from the same cycle of tradition.

Some of the Lucan narratives give us a little story complete in itself, in which the differing characters and conflicting motives of the actors contribute to the whole: the beautiful story of Martha, Mary and Jesus, and the dialogue between the penitent robber, his fellow-malefactor, and Jesus on the cross are examples. The healing of the ten lepers (*c.* xvii.) is particularly instructive in this respect. The story is fairly clearly a variant and an expansion of the story of the healing of the leper which appears in Mk. i. 40 (Lk. v. 12 f.). The main *motifs* recur. The appeal of the leper, the pity of Jesus, the command to shew himself to the priest, are all retained in the later variant. But a miracle which shews the mercy and the power of Jesus, and perhaps his respect for the Mosaic Law, has now been developed into a little story which leads up to a definite moral.

The journey to the priests makes the opportunity for the healing to take effect, and the story culminates in the return to Jesus of the outcast Samaritan, whose gratitude is contrasted with the ingratitude of his Jewish fellows.

Corresponding to the new type of narrative is a new type of 'parable' which is found in these Lucan sections, and here only. The parables of the Good Samaritan, the Rich Fool, Dives and Lazarus, the Pharisee and the Publican, are none of them true parables, inasmuch as they do not teach by analogy. They are stories which, by giving examples of types of character, convey directly their own moral. The parable of the two sons almost falls into the same category, for the relation between the prodigal and his father is more than *analogy* to the relation of the penitent to the Father in heaven.

Three other parables peculiar to Luke—the Unjust Steward (*c.* xvi.), the Unjust Judge (*c.* xviii.), and the Importunate Friend (*c.* xi.)—may be regarded as a group to themselves, since they are marked by certain striking similarities both in form (see notes and special introductions) and in content. Like most of the synoptic parables, and unlike the group of Lucan parables last considered, these parables all teach by analogy; but they are unique among the parables in that the point which in each of them affords analogy to a spiritual truth, portrays conduct which in itself is reprehensible and is recognised as such.

For the most part Luke may be supposed to have incorporated his material without considerable change. But it was his aim to write a connected narrative (καθεξῆς γράψαι), and accordingly we find the discourses and parables set in a quasi-historical setting which in general is probably to be ascribed to the evangelist himself (x. 1, xi. 16, 37, xii. 1, xv. 1-2). Sometimes (e.g. *c.* xiv.) the setting is highly artificial and unconvincing. We may also observe that a scene which at first sight appears to be a harmonious and coherent whole, is found not infrequently on closer inspection to be a combination of material which is not truly coherent. A peculiarly striking example is the parable of the debtors which is worked into the Lucan account of the anointing of Jesus by a woman (see introduction and notes to *c.* vii.). Similar incoherences may be observed in the account of the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth, and in the parable of the Good Samaritan with its prefatory dialogue. How far the evangelist is to be held responsible for this superficiality of treatment, or how far he is merely reproducing his source, it is perhaps impossible to determine.

As to the *provenance* of Luke's special material there is much to be said for the conjecture that it was largely derived from Palestinian sources. The sympathy shewn for Samaritans would be natural in some Palestinian Church which had been in touch with the Samaritan Mission and the liberal movement inaugurated by Stephen and his fellows. Again, the high value set upon poverty and the hostility to wealth would perhaps be not less congenial in Greek-speaking churches of Palestine than among the 'poor saints' of Jerusalem who looked to James for leadership. The conjecture that much of the material took shape in the Church of Caesarea is at least attractive.[1] A Greek-speaking city, the civil capital of Palestine, in tradition the scene of Peter's first Gentile convert, and the home of Philip the evangelist of Samaria, Caesarea would provide the kind of background which seems to suit the internal character of much of the material peculiar to Luke. There is good reason to suppose that a great part was first written down in the Greek language, for the influence of the LXX is strong, and the style has the freshness of original Greek composition. Moreover, a Church such as that of Caesarea might be expected to combine an instinctive understanding of Jewish national aspiration with a universalistic interpretation of the Gospel, both of which are in a high degree characteristic of many Lucan narratives.

---

[1] Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 219.

# IV

# THEOLOGICAL IDEAS

THE greater part of the Gospel is, as we have seen, derived from earlier sources, and on the whole the writer treats his sources in a conservative spirit. His main object is to give a historical survey of the events in which he and his fellow-believers have a close interest. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that the work was directly 'tendencious,' or that the writer wished to commend a particular theological attitude.[1] The book reflects the primitive Christian ideas of the materials which it has embodied. At the same time it is possible to discern in the book certain interests and tendencies of the evangelist's own age.

## PAULINISM

The ancient Church saw in St. Luke's Gospel the Gospel of Paul, and some modern critics, e.g. Renan, have regarded the Gospel as fundamentally Pauline. In so far as Paul was the great apologist of the Gentile Mission, Luke shares his position. The rejection of the Christ by the Jews and the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles are dominant themes in Luke and Acts. But Luke's interests and point of view were widely different from Paul's. The Pauline controversies about the Law and the peculiar Pauline theology in which they issued are not determining factors in St. Luke's presentation of the Gospel story. In Luke we are appreciably further from the Pauline spirit than in Mark. Most striking is the entire absence of a Pauline interpretation of the Cross. The Marcan saying concerning the death of the Son of Man as "a ransom for many" (Mk. x. 45),[1] and the declaration at the Last Supper that the cup is "the blood of the Covenant poured out for many," are absent. There is indeed no *theologia crucis* beyond the affirmation that the Christ must suffer, since so the prophetic scriptures had foretold.

---

[1] Cf. an article by E. F. Scott in *H.Th.R.*, April 1926, pp. 143 f., on 'The New Criticism of the Gospels.' He questions "the principle that the Gospels must be viewed almost exclusively as theological documents." "Their historical interest is not to be placed third or fourth, but first."

## ESCHATOLOGY

The kingdom of God holds its place in this Gospel as the leading category, and it retains its primary meaning of 'the reign of God' which is to close and supersede the present world order. The eschatological connotation of the term as used in Mark and Q is no less unmistakable in Luke. (See e.g. xi. 2, xiii. 28, 29, xvii. 20, xxii. 16, 18, 30. Also xxiii. 51.) At the same time the thought of the *imminence* of the kingdom is less prominent than in Mark. The opening summary of Christ's preaching in Mark ("The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the Gospel," Mk. i. 15) is replaced by the sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth on the text from Isaiah lxi: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor. . . ." This note pervades the Gospel, and the prominence of the thought that the preaching of the kingdom (*εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, iv. 43, viii. 1, cf. ix. 6, xx. 1) brings relief to the poor and afflicted and absolution to the penitent to some extent weakens the eschatological association and fosters the thought that the good news of the kingdom is a present possession for those who receive it. The more striking Marcan prophecies of the *imminence* of the kingdom are softened (cf. ix. 27, xxii. 69), while other passages in the Gospel betray an attitude of some suspicion towards those who look for an immediate fulfilment of the hope. Thus in xix. 11 the statement is prefixed to the parable of the Pounds that Jesus spoke the parable "because they thought that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear." In xxi. 8 the disciples are bidden to suspect, not only (as in Mark) those who shall say in Christ's name

---

[1] In xxi. 28 the word *ἀπολύτρωσις* is used of the final appearance of the Son of Man. Cf. note *ad loc.* See also Lk. i. 68, ii. 38.

"I am he," but even those who shall proclaim "The time is at hand." The later verses of the eschatological discourse in Luke also seem to suggest that an interval—perhaps a considerable interval—is to elapse before the end. Again, it is to be noted that in the parting words of Christ to his disciples (xxiv. fin.) the emphasis falls upon the approaching gift of the Holy Spirit, not upon the kingdom.

Yet, although there is this perceptible tendency to weaken the idea of the imminence of the end, the evangelist shares the perspective of all primitive Christendom, and pictures the final conclusion of the world-order with the sudden return of the Son of Man (xvii. 22 f. and xxi. 35-36).

## CHRISTOLOGY

The Gospel is written by a believer for believers, and therefore assumes the divine character and divine mission of the Person whose life and work it describes. But the book is not controlled by any definite doctrinal interest, and it would be a mistake to think of the writer as though he represented some particular type of Christological theory. In the main he follows his sources.

The fundamental affirmation is that Jesus is the Christ foretold by prophecy. The idea, though not the word, is central in the angelic annunciation to Mary and in the opening stanzas of Zacharias' hymn. So, too, to Symeon it was revealed that he should not die until he had seen the Lord's Christ. The angel at the nativity speaks of Jesus as "Christ the Lord." The recognition of Jesus by the demons, and the confession of Peter "Thou art the Christ" are taken over from Mark. He is crucified as a Messianic claimant (xxiii. 2), and his crucifixion is afterwards shewn to fulfil Messianic prophecy (xxiv. 26, 46). The resurrection confirms the faith of his disciples in his Messiahship which the crucifixion had appeared to destroy (xxiv. 21).

Old Testament precedent made it natural to regard the Messianic ruler as standing to God in the relationship of son. In the synoptic Gospels the two terms Christ and Son of God are found sometimes in close proximity (Mk. xiv. 61, Mt. xvi. 16), and apparently they are practically synonymous (cf. Lk. iv. 41). The title 'Son of God' is, however, in itself wider in its scope and more general in its meaning; hence it is not unnatural to find that the term Christ tended to become a personal appellative, except when it was used with a direct reference to the Jewish hope, while Son of God became the favourite term to describe the status and nature of Jesus. 'Son of God' is the most prominent title in Mark. It is perhaps significant that in the Lucan version of the trial before the Sanhedrin the two titles are separated, and that it is to the question "Art thou the Son of God?" that Jesus replies, "Ye say that I am." In Mark Jesus is declared Son of God by a divine voice at his baptism by John, and the divine declaration is repeated at the Transfiguration following upon Peter's confession. Both these passages are taken over into Luke, but Luke, like Matthew, presses back the divine sonship to the beginnings of the earthly life of Jesus. His birth is ascribed to the direct operation of the Spirit, and for that reason Mary's son is to be called 'Son of the Most High.' Further than this Luke does not go. The idea of the pre-existence of the Son is nowhere suggested. The thought moves on other lines. The idea of the incarnation of a divine pre-existent being does not, as the history of exegesis shews, accommodate itself easily to the narrative of the Annunciation to Mary. Yet there is no reason to suppose that Luke was conscious of differing from Paul or from other Christian teachers. Ideas were still fluid, and the problems of doctrinal construction were not realised. Twice Jesus is represented as applying to himself the title 'the Son': in the parable of the wicked husbandmen (Marcan) it is plain that Jesus is the son and heir of the Lord of the vineyard; in a saying from Q (x. 22) the Johannine doctrine of the mutual knowledge of Father and Son comes to clear expression.

The title 'the Son of Man' Luke reproduces freely from both his chief sources. The term is used, according to the texts, exclusively by Jesus about himself,[1] and predominantly, though not exclusively, in connexion with the Passion, the Resurrection, or the

---

[1] But see ix. 26 (Mk.) and xii. 8 (Q) where the identification of the speaker with the Son of Man who 'confesses' and 'denies' at the day of judgement is not inevitable.

Parousia. The term is almost confined to the passages derived from Mark or Q. Of the five occurrences in verses peculiar to Luke (xvii. 22, xviii. 8, xix. 10, xxi. 36, xxiv. 7) the first and the last two may be disregarded since they are closely connected with sayings from Mark or Q ; there remain xviii. 8—an appended saying at the end of a parable—and xix. 10 : " the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost " (the conclusion of the narrative of Zacchaeus).

A usage appears in St. Luke's Gospel whereby Jesus in narrative is referred to as ὁ Κύριος. The primitive confession of Jesus as Lord (Ro. x. 9) has reacted upon the style of narratives which describe his earthly life. The usage is peculiar to Luke of the synoptic evangelists, and in the Lucan Gospel it is confined to narratives or to editorial introductions peculiar to that Gospel (vii. 13, 19 ; x. 1, 39, 41 ; xii. 42 ; xiii. 15 ; xvii. 5, 6 ; xviii. 6 ; xix. 8 ; xxii. 61 (*bis*)). As the term is never introduced by the evangelist into Marcan narratives (except xxii. 61, where the narrative is extensively reshaped), it may be inferred that Luke found the usage in his special source or sources. The occurrence of the usage in introductions to Q material (e.g. x. 1, xii. 42) and its general absence in Marcan contexts have been held to support the conjecture that Q had been already combined with some of the peculiar Lucan matter before its incorporation in Luke. But it may well be that the usage would come naturally to the evangelist himself when he was composing a fresh setting for a paragraph. There is strong reason to assign x. 1 (the appointment of ' the seventy ') to his own hand. The usage occurs sporadically in St. John—possibly only in editorial additions.

Lastly, we record the single use of σωτήρ of Jesus in the angelic message to the shepherds (ii. 11). The word is never found elsewhere in the synoptic Gospels except Lk. i. 47 (the Magnificat), and there it is used, as often in the O.T., of God. See note on ii. 11.

## V

## LANGUAGE, STYLE, AND VOCABULARY

The literary versatility of the evangelist is shewn at the outset. The Preface is a carefully balanced sentence written in irreproachable literary Greek. After the Preface there is an abrupt change, and the style of the infancy narratives is as close to the style of the Greek Old Testament as the Greek of Lucian is to classical Attic prose. The transition proves the author to be a conscious artist. He could, if he wished, have written throughout as a professional man of letters; if he does not maintain his polished and polite style, it is because he judges it unsuitable to transpose the traditional material into another idiom.

If the language of the Gospel as a whole be compared with the Greek of contemporary writers of the literary language, e.g. Josephus, one broad difference between the two stands out: unlike the Greek of Josephus, the Greek of the Gospel is strongly marked by the influence of Semitic idiom. In view of the Jewish origin of the Christian religion, this pervasive Semitic atmosphere causes no surprise. But the true interpretation of this undoubted Semitism in its relation to the spoken Greek of the day is a difficult and delicate subject of enquiry.

The discoveries of the papyri texts in Egypt have carried the study of the language of the N.T. into a new stage. It had been usual to suppose that the obvious difference between the style of the N.T. writers on the one hand and pagan writers on the other was to be accounted for by the hypothesis that the N.T. writers, being in the main Jews, wrote and spoke a Semitic-Greek dialect. It has, however, been shewn by students of the papyri—particularly A. Deissmann and Moulton—that the great majority of the so-called

Semitisms in the N.T. can be paralleled from documents written in the vernacular Greek of the time. A residuum of cases remain where a construction or idiom, to which no true parallel from Greek sources has been found, finds a ready explanation by reference to Hebrew or to Aramaic.[1] Broadly speaking, however, the generalisations have won acceptance (1) that the Greek of the N.T. is on the whole the common Greek of the Empire; and (2) that evidence has failed to confirm the hypothesis that there was a special Semitic dialect of the *Κοινή*. Moreover, against the hypothesis that there existed such a dialect appeal may be made to the writings of Greek-speaking Jews—Philo, Josephus, St. Paul—where we might expect to find traces of the influence of such a dialect if it existed. They shew no trace of it. The epistles of St. Paul—apart from O.T. quotations—are vigorous examples of the ordinary vernacular language attested by the papyri.

The N.T. documents, however, differ considerably from one another in their literary character, and, as applied to the Gospels in general and to St. Luke's Gospel in particular, the generalisations call for qualification in two respects.

(1) Jesus himself and the earliest disciples without doubt spoke Aramaic, and the earliest traditions which lie behind the Gospels may be assumed to have taken shape at the first in Aramaic. It is probable that the Christians who first translated the tradition from Aramaic into Greek thought in Aramaic more readily than in Greek. This probability is confirmed by the actual character of the Greek of Mark and Q. It is easy, says Wellhausen, to transpose them back into their Semitic original. Yet it would be a mistake to speak of Mark as being written in a Semitic Greek dialect. Lagrange[2] rightly distinguishes between a dialect of a language and the style of a language as spoken by a foreigner: "No doubt many Jews spoke detestable Greek. But this no more makes a dialect than the French which some Germans speak makes a Franco-German

---

[1] E.g. the use of the genitive of a noun as an equivalent to an adjective *ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, and *εἰ* c. Fut. Indic. as a strong negative (Mk. viii. 12), both of which are at once explicable from Hebrew.

[2] *Saint Luc*, Introd. p. xcvi. I follow Lagrange closely in this chapter.

dialect." The foreigner may on occasion directly import a foreign idiom which is unintelligible without reference to his native language. More often he will avail himself of possible but unidiomatic phrases from his adopted language which correspond to the idiom of his native language. Wellhausen justly argues that scattered parallels from papyri to an apparent Semitism in the Gospels do not disprove Semitic influence. A writing might never trespass against possible usage and yet bear an unmistakably foreign appearance. "The man who had learned to think as a Hebrew was sure to fashion his speech in many ways differently from the born Greek, but only in the rarest cases has the difference of birth led to direct offence against the laws of grammar."[1]

(2) The second qualification arises from the literary influence of the LXX. The translation Greek of the LXX reflects the Hebrew idiom of the original, and the direct influence of the language of the Sacred Book has imparted a Hebrew colouring to writers who found in it a natural model for religious narrative.

A precise delimitation of these two strains of Semitic influence is often difficult. The two languages—Hebrew and Aramaic—naturally have much in common. In Mark and Q unmistakable Hebraisms are rare,[2] and the extent of literary reminiscence appears to be small. On the other hand, in these writings the Aramaic of the popular tradition may be felt throughout. Both elements are present in Luke, and in Luke the Hebraic colouring is more pronounced than in any other book of the New Testament. Yet there is no reason to suspect that Luke knew Hebrew. He never goes behind the LXX to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. The Hebraic influence is mediated by the LXX. It is of high significance that the most literary and most Greek of the writers of the New Testament[3] is the writer to shew most strongly the influence of the Hebraistic LXX. A genuine and native Hellene is drawing into himself the spirit and style of the Greek-Hebrew Bible, appropriating the Jewish Scriptures as the true possession of the Gentile believer.

---

[1] Radermacher, *N.T. Grammatik*, p. 20.

[2] Yet they are found. See Mk. i. 9 *καὶ ἐγένετο . . . ἦλθεν*; viii. 12 *εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον.*

[3] The writer to the Hebrews should be excepted.

The following Lucan idioms may be regarded as Hebraisms :

(1) *καὶ ἐγένετο* with a following verb. On the three constructions with which the phrase is used in Luke see note *infra* on i. 8 and Plummer, p. 45. The phrase is very frequent in the LXX to represent ויהי ו. It is not an Aramaic idiom.

(2) The frequent use of *καὶ ἰδού*. *ἰδού* itself is good classical Greek, but the recurrence of *καὶ ἰδού* may be ascribed to the LXX rendering of the recurrent Hebrew והנה. *ἰδού* occurs six times only in Mark and never in narrative. *καὶ ἰδού* is not found in Mark, but is frequent in Matthew as well as in Luke.

(3) *ἐν τῷ* c. Infin. after *καὶ ἐγένετο* corresponds to the LXX rendering of ב with Infin. The construction *ἐν τῷ* c. Infin. occurs sporadically in good Greek writers (cf. Moulton, *Prol.* p. 215) but not apparently to denote time (*ib.* p. 249). The idiom is not Aramaic, and may with some confidence be regarded as Hebraism. *ἐν τῷ* c. Infin. of time is found twice in Mark (iv. 4, vi. 48, in the former case following *καὶ ἐγένετο*) and three times in Matthew (xiii. 4, 25, xxvii. 12). In Luke it occurs over thirty times. Luke distinguishes carefully between the Present and Aorist Infin., the latter being used only of completed action.

(4) The use of *ἐνώπιον* corresponding to a frequent LXX rendering of לפני. The word is found as a preposition occasionally in the papyri. The significance lies in the frequency of the usage in Luke. Cf. i. 15 n. Not in Mark or Matthew.

(5) Phrases formed from the word *πρόσωπον*, though not impossible in Greek, may probably be described as Hebraising. i. 76 (cf. vii. 27); ix. 52 (*πρὸ προσώπου*); ii. 31 (*κατὰ πρόσωπον*); xxi. 35 (*ἐπὶ πρόσωπον*). Cf. also ix. 51, 53.

(6) xxii. 15 *ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα* recalls an habitual LXX method of rendering the Hebrew Absol. Infin. prefixed to a Finite verb.

(7) *τιθέναι, τίθεσθαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ* (a phrase peculiar in the N.T. to the Lucan writings i. 66, xxi. 14, Acts v. 4; cf. also Lk. ix. 44 *θέσθαι εἰς τὰ ὦτα*) corresponds closely to a LXX rendering of the Hebrew. Cf. 1 Regn. xxi. 12, xxix. 10; 2 Regn. xiii. 33.

Other Hebraistic phrases are *δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν* (8 times), *ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετά* (i. 72, x. 37), *μεγαλύνειν ἔλεος μετά* (i. 58), *ποιεῖν* *κράτος* (i. 51). Like the LXX Luke transliterates the Hebrew words *σίκερα* (i. 15), *βάτος* (xvi. 6), *κόρος* (xvi. 7).

Further Semitic idioms which are probably due to Aramaic influence are the following :

(1) The periphrastic construction of the imperfect of the verb 'to be' with a participle. The construction is good Greek, but in true Greek usage it is found only when there is a definite intention to emphasise continuity of action. Aramaic, on the other hand, uses the construction very freely, often as a mere equivalent for the Imperfect. The Aramaic usage is very pronounced in Mark (16 times). The construction is found about 30 times in Luke and 24 times in Acts. Several of the cases in Luke may be classified as normal Greek usage, e.g. iv. 38, 44 ; vi. 12. On the other hand Semitism may be recognised in ix. 53, xi. 14, xiii. 10, 11, xiv. 1, and the frequency of the usage in doubtful cases may be set down to the influence of Aramaic.

(2) The use of *ἄρχεσθαι* in a weak sense without emphasis upon the idea of 'beginning' is found occasionally in good Greek. In Aramaic שָׁרִי is frequently used virtually as a mere auxiliary. A corresponding use of *ἄρχεσθαι* is common in Mark (about 25 times). Luke appears to avoid a merely conventional use of the word such as is found in Mark, but a weak use of the word occurs too frequently (about 24 times) not to suggest Semitism. (Cf. iii. 8 n.) The idiom is not Hebraic.

(3) The frequent use of *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν*, where *ἀποκρίνομαι* means merely 'to begin to speak,' is not Greek, but is readily explained from Semitic usage. Cf. P.B. *s.v. ἀποκρίνομαι*.

(4) The Semitic custom of prefixing to a principal verb a participle expressive of movement or attitude may probably be traced in xv. 25 *ἐρχόμενος ἤγγισεν*, xv. 18 *ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι*, xv. 20 *ἀναστὰς ἦλθεν*, perhaps also in xiv. 28, 31, xvi. 6 *καθίσας*. In the latter cases, however, the participle is too natural to compel us to look for non-Greek influence.

(5) The free use of pronouns attached to nouns and verbs recalls Semitic idiom. A clear case of Aramaism is the use of a relative at the beginning of a clause resumed by a pronoun at the end : *οὗ . . . αὐτοῦ* iii. 17 (Q).

(6) The Semitic use of a substantive following the construct case as the equivalent of a qualifying adjective is the certain explanation of *ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας* xvi. 8, *ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας* xviii. 6. A

special case of the same idiom is the Semitic use of a noun following upon 'son of' to describe the quality of a person or thing: 'a son of peace' for 'a peaceful man,' etc. Cf. v. 34 (Mk.), x. 6, xvi. 8. No Greek parallel to this usage is forthcoming.

(7) The use of ἰδού almost with the meaning 'since' (French *il y a*), xiii. 7, 16. Cf. Mk. viii. 2.

(8) The use of the verb προστίθημι in place of an adverb 'again.' xix. 11, xx. 11, 12, cf. Acts xii. 3, corresponds to Semitic usage. It is not normal Greek, but it occurs repeatedly in Josephus, being the one Semitic mannerism which has been detected in his style.

Other words and phrases of a Semitic colouring are εἰρήνη as a salutation (x. 5, 6), ὁμολογεῖν ἐν c. Dat. (xii. 8), καρπὸν ποιεῖν (iii. 8).[1]

Alongside the Semitic colouring of Luke's style we have to recognise (1) many stylistic improvements of the rude Greek of Mark, and (2) the relatively frequent appearance of some idiomatic Greek constructions.

In dealing with Mark, Luke has thoroughly recast the language. We have already noted that the Marcan εὐθύς entirely disappears from Marcan sections in Luke, and only one Marcan historic present is retained (viii. 49). In place of Mark's predilection for parataxis Luke tends to substitute a more periodic form of sentence, frequently replacing principal verbs by participles. The conjunction δέ is very frequently substituted for καί. Hawkins notes that whereas of the 88 sections and subsections of Mark no less than 80 begin with καί, out of the total number of 145 sections in Luke 53 only begin with καί, while 83 have δέ as the second word.[2]

The following Lucan idioms testify to a relatively high standard of literary style:

(1) The Optative occurs but rarely in the N.T. apart from the phrase μὴ γένοιτο (frequent in Paul, once also in Lk.—xx. 16). In the first century it was generally obsolescent. It is not found in Matthew or John, and occurs but once in Mark (xi. 14, a negative wish). In Luke, on the other hand, we find the Optative once used for a positive wish (i. 38), and the Optative (with or without ἄν) fairly frequently

---

[1] Cf. note *ad loc.* Lagrange quotes καρποποιός from Eur. *Rhes.* 964.

[2] *Horae Synopticae*$^2$, pp. 150 f.

used in indirect question after a principal verb in the past tense. But it is to be noted that Luke never follows the Atticists in using the Optative in a final clause.

(2) The attraction of the relative into the case of its antecedent is by no means confined to literary style in the later Greek. It is found not infrequently in papyri. Yet it is rare in Matthew (twice) and Mark (once). On the other hand it is frequent in Paul, Hebrews, John, as well as in Luke. A certain idiomatic quality probably attaches to the use when the antecedent is attracted into the relative clause, as in i. 20, iii. 19, xii. 40 (Q = Mt. xxiv. 44), xix. 37.

(3) The use of the article before an indirect question, transforming the clause into a quasi-substantive, indicates a certain Greek elegance of style. Cf. i. 62, ix. 46, xix. 48, xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24 ; Acts iv. 21, xxii. 30. Found also in Ro. viii. 26, 1 Thess. iv. 1.

(4) The good Greek usage of *τοῦ* c. Infin. to express purpose is found in Matthew, Hebrews, and possibly in Paul, but it is especially characteristic of Luke (i. 74, 77, 79, ii. 24, 27, viii. 5, xii. 42 (Q = Mt. xxiv. 45), xxi. 22, xxii. 31, xxiv. 45. It is not unknown in the papyri.

(5) *πρίν*, which elsewhere in the N.T. is invariably constructed with the Infin., is found in Luke once with the Subj. (ii. 26) and once with the Optat. (Acts xxv. 16). In both these cases the construction is correctly used to follow a negative. "The papyrus writers are not so particular" (Moulton, *Prol.* p. 169 n. 1).

It is to be noted that these idiomatic turns of expression are not less frequent in the simple Hebraistic Greek of the first two chapters than elsewhere. Whatever Luke's sources may have been, he has not failed to impress upon them the marks of his own workmanship.

The total Lucan vocabulary is more extensive than that of any other N.T. writer. The total number of words used in Luke-Acts (excluding proper names) has been reckoned at 2697.[1] The total number in the Gospel alone is estimated at about 1800.[2] Of the total Lucan vocabulary some 750 words are peculiar to the Lucan writings in the N.T., and of these 261 are peculiar to the Gospel, and 58 common to Luke and Acts.[1] It is further interesting to record that Hawkins gives 101 words found in Luke (with Acts) and Paul only,[2] and 16 words found only in Luke and Hebrews (besides 8 which are also in Acts).

---

[1] J. Ritchie Smith quoted in Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke*, pt. i. p. 1. Cadbury estimates the vocabulary of the Pauline Epistles (excluding the Pastorals) at 2170 words, of which 593 are peculiar to Paul in the N.T.

[2] *Ib.* p. 2.

Professor Cadbury [3] has carried out a careful classification of Luke's vocabulary from *α*-*ε* according to the method of analysis adopted in Wilhelm Schmid's *Atticismus* [4] for Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Aristides, Aelian, and the younger Philostratus. A comparison with Schmid's results for these writers appears to shew that "every element of a Hellenistic vocabulary is present in Luke, but the post-classical element is considerably larger than in any of the Atticists whom Schmid studies." Cadbury, however, argues that a certain deduction should be made for the considerable body of quasi-technical Jewish and Christian terms, and on the whole concludes that "the vocabulary of Luke, while it has its natural affinities with the Greek of the Bible, is not so far removed from the literary style of the Atticists as to be beyond comparison with them."

An interesting test may be applied to Lucan usage from the lexical notes of Phrynichus. In a number of cases Luke's taste has led him to correct words and phrases in his sources which are found in Phrynichus's list of condemned vulgarisms.

Thus ἐσχάτως ἔχει is condemned by Phryn. ccclxviii.[5] It occurs Mk. v. 23. Luke substitutes ἀπέθνησκεν (viii. 42).

πτῶμα in the sense of 'a corpse' is condemned by Phrynichus cccli. Luke substitutes σῶμα for πτῶμα xxiii. 52 (cf. Mk. xv. 45), and probably also at xvii. 37 (cf. Mt. xxiv. 28).

ῥαφίς 'a needle' is condemned by Phrynichus lxxii. For ῥαφίς (Mk. x. 25) Luke substitutes βελόνη (xviii. 25), the word which Phrynichus endorses.

---

[1] See the list in Hawkins, *op. cit.* pp. 198 f. Of the 319 words in the Gospel peculiar in the N.T. to the Lucan writings, no less than 118 are compound verbs. See the Index of Greek Words.

[2] *Ib.* p. 156.

[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 8 f.

[4] *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, 4 vols. and index, Stuttgart, 1887–1897.

[5] The references are to Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*.

*κοράσιον*, condemned by Phrynichus lvi., occurs Mk. v. 41. Luke substitutes *ἡ παῖς*.

On the other hand Luke himself uses a considerable number of words which Phrynichus condemns or disapproves: *αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι* (xxi. 24), *ἀλέκτωρ* (xxii. 34, 60, 61), *ἀποκριθῆναι*, *βασίλισσα* (xi. 31), *γογγύζειν* (v. 30), *γρηγορεῖν* (xii. 37), *δύνῃ* in a principal sentence (xvi. 2), *ἐγκάθετος* (xx. 20), *ἐμπτύω* (xviii. 32), *εὐχαριστεῖν* (xvii. 16), *καθώς*, *κρούειν τὴν θύραν* (xiii. 25), *λυχνία* (viii. 16, xi. 33), *μενοῦν* at the beginning of a sentence (xi. 28), *μεσονύκτιον* (xi. 5) (acc. to Phryn. xxxvi. *ποιητικόν, οὐ πολιτικόν*), *νοσσός* (ii. 24) and *νοσσία* (xiii. 34) (Phryn. clxxxii. prescribes *νεοττός, νεοττίον*), *οἰκοδεσπότης* (xii. 39), *ὄρθρος* of the dawn (xxiv. 1, cf. Mk. xvi. 2) (Phryn. ccxlii. appeals to ancient usage, which used *ὄρθρος* only of the period before daybreak), *οὐθείς* (xxii. 35, xxiii. 14), *παιδίσκη* (xii. 45, xxii. 56) of a maidservant, *πανδοχεῖον*, *πανδοχεύς* (x. 34, 35) spelt with *χ*, *πάντοτε*, *ποταπός* (i. 29, vii. 39) for *ποῖος*, *σίναπι* (xiii. 19, xvii. 6), *σκορπίζειν* (xi. 23) (Phryn. cxciii. *σκορπίζεται* Ionic, *σκεδάννυται* Attic).

# VI

## TEXT

The text printed in this edition is that of Westcott and Hort.

Fresh evidence and further investigation have tended in certain respects to modify Westcott's and Hort's theory of the history of the text in the early centuries. The geographical restriction of the use of the 'Neutral text' has strengthened the hypothesis that this was in truth the local text of Alexandria. On the other hand the discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac and further investigation of the Old Latin have at once shewn the wide distribution of 'Western' readings, and disclosed a greater variety of local texts than Hort realised.[1] Again, the discovery of codex Θ has brought to light a combination of readings to some extent supported by certain cursives which cannot be satisfactorily classified either with 'Neutral' or 'Western.'

"The ultimate aim of textual criticism," writes Canon Streeter, "is to get back behind the diverse local texts to a single text, viz. to that which the authors originally wrote. But the high road to that conclusion is first to recover the local texts of the great Churches, and then to work back to a common original that will explain them all" (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 39). The present work offers no fresh material for the laborious task of constructing that high road. There seems to be little doubt that when the high road is completed, the main foundation of the final text will still be the great Uncials Bℵ, on which Westcott and Hort built their text half a century ago. "Of the five early local texts, that of Alexandria (Bℵ) is, as we should expect from the tradition of textual scholarship native to the place, undoubtedly the best." "But," Canon Streeter continues, "no MS. and no line of textual tradition is infallible, and it will not infrequently appear that the true reading of a particular passage, lost at Alexandria, has been preserved in one or other of the rival texts" (*ib.* p. 32). The time has not come to decide how often Alexandria has erred. By general consent it would as yet be premature to attempt to revise the W.H. text as a whole, and sporadic alterations of an authoritative text are to be deprecated. The only liberties that I have taken with the W.H. text are: (1) I have not invariably reproduced the marginal readings; usually, however, I have given them in the apparatus with their principal supporters; (2) I have on occasion changed the punctuation for reasons which are stated in the notes.

---

[1] Hort of course was well aware that the 'Western text' was not homogeneous. "The Western text is not to be thought of as a single recension, complete from the first. However its parent copy or copies may have differed from the originals, there must have been no little subsequent and progressive change" (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, editio minor, p. 550).

Apart from textual evidence to elucidate W.H.'s brackets in the text, and their readings in the margin, the apparatus is restricted to variant readings which seem to be of intrinsic interest. In these cases I have tried to include a fairly complete statement of the evidence of those MSS. which the labours of textual critics have shewn to be representative of, or at least closely related to, some pre-Byzantine form of text. Most of the evidence has been taken direct from the 8th edition of Tischendorf's New Testament, but I have supplemented Tischendorf by reference to Professor Burkitt's translation of the Sinaitic Syriac,[1] to Mr. Horner's translations of the Egyptian versions,[2] to the Koridethi MS. (Θ),[3] the Freer MS. (W),[4] 1 etc.,[5] 69 etc.,[6] 565,[7] 700.[8]

The notation in the apparatus follows C. R. Gregory, *Die griechischen Handschriften des N.T.* (Leipzig, 1908).

---

[1] *Evangelion da Mepharreshe*, ed. F. C. Burkitt (Cambridge, 1904).

[2] *The Coptic Version of the N.T. in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic*, vol. 2, St. Luke and St. John (Oxford, 1898); *The Coptic Version of the N.T. in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*, vol. 2, St. Luke (Oxford, 1911).

[3] Ed. Beerman and Gregory (Leipzig, 1913).

[4] Ed. H. A. Sanders, *New Testament MSS. in the Freer Collection*, pt. i. (New York, 1912).

[5] Ed. Lake, *Texts and Studies*, vol. vii.

[6] *A Collation of Four Important Manuscripts of the Gospels*, W. F. Ferrar, ed. T. K. Abbott (Dublin, 1877).

[7] Collation by Belsheim, *Das Evangelium des Marcus n. d. Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus* (Christiania, 1885), Appendix.

[8] H. C. Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604* (=Gregory 700) (D. Nutt, 1890).

# SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

## (1) Commentaries

B. S. Easton, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Edinburgh, 1926; printed U.S.A.).

E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (*Handb. z. N.T.* vol. ii. 1), Tübingen, 1st ed. 1919; 2nd ed. 1929. (The second edition did not come into the writer's hands until his commentary was almost complete.)

*Das Markusevangelium*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1926).

*Das Matthäusevangelium*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1927).

M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris, 1921).

A. Loisy, *Les Évangiles synoptiques* (Paris, 1907).

*L'Évangile selon Luc* (Paris, 1924).

C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (Macmillan, 1927).

A. Plummer, *Gospel according to St. Luke* (ICC., T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1896).

Lonsdale Ragg, *St. Luke* (*Westminster Commentaries*, Methuen, 1922).

A. E. J. Rawlinson, *St. Mark* (*Westminster Commentaries*, Methuen, 1925).

H. L. Strack u. P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vols. i., ii., iv. (München, 1922–1928).

J. Weiss, *Die drei älteren Evangelien* (vol. i. of *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 3rd ed., Göttingen, 1917), revised by W. Bousset.

J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Lucae* (Berlin, 1904).

*Das Markusevangelium*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1911).

*Das Evangelium Matthaei*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1914).

A. Wright, *The Gospel according to S. Luke in Greek, edited with parallels*, etc. (Macmillan, 1900).

Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas ausgelegt* (Leipzig, 1913).

## (2) Works of Reference, Dictionaries, etc.

F. Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, 2nd ed. (Macmillan, 1905).

J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. i. Prolegomena, 3rd ed. (T. & T. Clark, 1908); vol. ii. ed. by W. F. Howard (1919–20).

L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* (*Handb. z. N.T.* i. 1) (Tübingen, 1911).

*A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, W. F. Moulton, A. S. Geden (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1897).

*A Concordance to the Septuagint*, E. Hatch, H. A. Redpath (Oxford, 1897).

*The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament : illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources*, J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1914–1929).

*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Grimm, ed. J. H. Thayer, 4th ed. (T. & T. Clark, 1901).

*Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, D. W. Bauer (2nd ed. of E. Preuschen, *Handwörterbuch z. d. Schr. d. N.T.*) (Giessen, 1928).

*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. R. H. Charles, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1913).

E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3 vols. (4th ed. Leipzig, 1901–1909).

W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, 3rd ed. by H. Gressmann (Tübingen, 1926).

W. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (Oxford, 1903).

G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 10th ed. (London, 1903).

### (3) Other Literature

I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (Cambridge, First Series 1917 ; Second Series, 1924).

M. Albertz, *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche : ein Beitrag zur Formengeschichte des Urchristentums* (Berlin, 1921).

W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1921).

R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen, 1921).

F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906).

*The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus* (2nd ed., Constable & Co., 1922).

H. J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (*Harvard Theological Studies*, vi., Harvard Univ. Press, 1919).

*The Making of Luke-Acts* (Macmillan, 1927).

G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, trans. from the German (T. & T. Clark, 1902).

M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen, 1919).

P. Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, Gotha, 1891.

M. Goguel, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, vol. i. (E. Leroux, Paris, 1923).

A. Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, trans. from the German by J. R. Wilkinson (Williams & Norgate, 1908).

*Luke the Physician*, trans. from the German by J. R. Wilkinson (Williams & Norgate, 1907).

J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1909).

A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1910).

E. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge des Christentums*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1921–23).

E. Norden, *Antike Kunst-Prosa*, 2 vols. (Teubner, Leipzig, 1898).

*Agnostos Theos* (Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, 1913).

*Die Geburt des Kindes* (Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, 1924).

W. M. Ramsay, *Luke the Physician, and other Studies in the History of Religion* (London, 1908).

W. G. Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus* (London, Macmillan, 1881).

*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford, 1911).

K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Berlin, 1919).

A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (trans. from the German, London, 1910).

Spitta, *Die synoptische Grundschrift in ihrer Überlieferung durch das Lukasevangelium* (Leipzig, 1912).

V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Cambridge, vol. i., 1903; vol. ii., 1909).

B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (Macmillan, 1924).

V. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford, 1926).

B. Weiss, *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1907).

J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1917).

J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1911).

W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1913).

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| *B.C.H.* | *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.* Paris and Athens. |
| *G.J.V.* | *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, Schürer, 4th ed. |
| *H.Th.R.* | *Harvard Theological Review.* |
| *J.B.L.* | *Journal of Biblical Literature.* |
| *J.Th.S.* | *Journal of Theological Studies.* |
| M.M. | Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the New Testament, illustrated from the Papyri.* |
| *O.G.I.S.* | *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, ed. Dittenberger. |
| P.B. | *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, D. W. Bauer (revised edition of E. Preuschen, *Handwörterbuch z. d. Schr. d. N.T.*). |
| S.B. | Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* |
| *S.B.A.* | *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie.* |
| *T. and S.* | *Texts and Studies*, ed. J. Armitage Robinson. |
| *T. und U.* | *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ed. Gebhardt and Harnack. |
| *Th.L.Z.* | *Theologische Literaturzeitung.* |
| W.H. | Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek.* |
| *Z.N.T.W.* | *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.* |
| *Z.W.Th.* | *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie.* |

# ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

## The Preface (i. 1-4)

The Preface, composed in balanced form and classical idiom, conforms to a common type of Greek *προοίμιον* and implies a certain literary claim on the part of the author. Cf. Dioscurides Περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς i. 1 *πολλῶν οὐ μόνον ἀρχαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ νέων συνταξαμένων περὶ τῆς τῶν φαρμάκων σκευασίας τε καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δοκιμασίας, φίλτατε Ἄρειε, πειράσομαι παραστῆσαι σοὶ μὴ κενὴν μηδὲ ἄλογον ὁρμὴν ἐσχηκέναι με πρὸς τήνδε τὴν πραγματείαν*; Joseph. *C. Apion.* i. 1. 1 *ἱκανῶς μὲν ὑπολαμβάνω καὶ διὰ τῆς περὶ τὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν συγγραφῆς, κράτιστε ἀνδρῶν Ἐπαφρόδιτε, τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις αὐτῇ πεποιηκέναι φανερὸν περὶ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων· . . . ἐπεὶ δὲ συχνοὺς ὁρῶ . . . ἀπιστοῦντας . . . ᾠήθην δεῖν γράψαι συντόμως, τῶν μὲν . . . τὴν ἑκούσιον ἐλέγξαι ψευδολογίαν, τῶν δὲ τὴν ἄγνοιαν ἐπανορθώσασθαι, διδάξαι δὲ πάντας, ὅσοι τἀληθὲς εἰδέναι βούλονται . . .*; *ib.* ii. 1. 1 *διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου βιβλίου, τιμιώτατέ μοι Ἐπαφρόδιτε, . . . ἐπέδειξα . . . ἄρξομαι δὲ νῦν τοὺς ὑπολειπομένους τῶν γεγραφότων τι καθ' ἡμῶν ἐλέγχειν . . .*; *Bell. Jud.* i. 1. 1; *Letter of Aristeas*, 1, and other parallels in Klostermann. See also Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, p. 483; Wendland, *Handbuch z. N.T.* i. pp. 324 f.; Cadbury in *Beginnings*, ii. p. 489.

The Gospel and Acts formed two parts of one work, and the Preface is probably to be taken as a Preface to the whole work, the contents of the first part being resumed at the opening of the second (Acts i. 1). Cf. the Prefaces to Josephus *C. Apion.* cited above, and Diodorus Siculus who gives a Preface to his whole work at the beginning of Bk. I., and at the beginning of succeeding books usually resumes the book preceding and outlines the content of the book which is to come. Cf. Laqueur, 'Ephorus,' *Hermes*, xlvi., 1911, pp. 161 f.

Nothing is known of the Theophilus to whom the work is addressed. *κράτιστος* was used from the time of Septimius Severus as an official title for the equestrian Procurators, being equivalent to *vir egregius*; but in the first century the usage was not thus restricted.[1] In Acts xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25, the word is used in addressing the Procurator of Judaea; but Josephus (quoted above) uses the word in addressing his patron, the publisher Epaphroditus, and Dionysius Hal. in dedicating his work *De rhetoribus antiquis* to his patron (otherwise unknown) Ammaeus. The title implies that Theophilus was of good social position.[2] That he was a Christian is a probable though not a certain conclusion from *v.* 4. See note. Dedication to an individual does not imply that the work was not intended for the public. Cf. the address of *C. Apion.* to Epaphroditus cited above, and *ib.* bk. ii. *fin.* σοὶ δέ, Ἐπαφρόδιτε, μάλιστα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀγαπῶντι καὶ διὰ σὲ τοῖς ὁμοίως βουλησομένοις περὶ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν εἰδέναι τοῦτο καὶ τὸ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γεγράφθω βιβλίον.

The writer lives in a time when the impulse was widely felt to embody in narrative form the tradition which the original eye-witnesses and preachers had handed on to them. He too has accurately studied the whole history, and has therefore decided to construct an orderly and reliable account of what Theophilus has already learnt. The perspective is that of an age when αὐτόπται have passed away, and the need is felt for a trustworthy written account of the words and work of Jesus and of the salvation which he brought. We may compare Heb. ii. 3 f. πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας, ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν;

The Preface forms a single period, with protasis (introduced by ἐπειδήπερ) and apodosis. Protasis and apodosis each contain three cola, and each colon in the apodosis contains a phrase which answers to a phrase in the corresponding colon of the protasis: Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν | **ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν** περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, | καθὼς **παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν** οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, || ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς | **καθεξῆς** σοι **γράψαι**, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, | ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων **τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.** Cf. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 1-20.

---

[1] Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, E.T. iv. p. 75; Hirschfeld, *Röm. Verwaltungsgesch.* i. p. 273; E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, i. p. 6.

[2] Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 12; Theophr. *Charact.* 5.

ΕΠΕΙΔΗΠΕΡ ΠΟΛΛΟΙ *ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι* 1 I.
*διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων,*

1. *ἐπειδήπερ*] Good Greek; class. and later writers, e.g. Jos. Pref. to *B.J.* 6 Ἀρχαιολογεῖν μὲν δὴ τὰ Ἰουδαίων . . . νῦν τε ἄκαιρον ᾠήθην εἶναι καὶ ἄλλως περιττόν, ἐπειδήπερ καὶ Ἰουδαίων πολλοὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ τὰ τῶν προγόνων συνετάξαντο μετ᾽ ἀκριβείας. Here only in the Greek Bible. For the grammatical construction of the Preface cf. the apostolic decree Acts xv. 24-25 ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν . . . ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν . . .

*πολλοί*] Greek writers very frequently begin a formal speech or preface with some part or derivative of *πολύς*. Cf. Acts xxiv. 2 (speech of Tertullus), 10 (speech of Paul), Heb. i. 1; Ecclus. *Prol.*, Dioscorides, quoted above, Xen. *Mem.* and other exx. quoted by Cadbury, *Beginnings*, ii. p. 492. That the use of a part of *πολύς* was felt to be stylistically effective does not, of course, imply that the statement itself is not true to fact. Luke is speaking of what was matter of common knowledge. He himself used two, and probably several, written documents in the composition of his own Gospel.

*ἐπεχείρησαν*] Orig. (*Hom. in Luc.* i.) suggests that the word implies criticism of *τῶν προπετῶς καὶ χωρὶς χαρίσματος ἐλθόντων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῶν εὐαγγελίων. ἐπιχειρεῖν* may be used (as Acts xix. 13) of undertakings which the speaker or writer criticises adversely, but this criticism is not implied by the word itself (cf. *C. Apion.* i. 2; Polyb. iii. 1. 4, xii. 28. 3), and is not to be understood here. Luke, in point of fact, associates himself with his predecessors: *ἔδοξε κἀμοί.* It may, however, be presumed that, had he been entirely satisfied with their work, he would not have written himself.

*ἀνατάξασθαι*] A rare word. Cf. Plut. *De soll. anim.*, *Moralia* 968 C, D; Irèn. *Adv. haer.* iii. 24 (Harvey) of Ezra's 'reconstruction' of the Scriptures after their destruction in the captivity: *τοὺς τῶν προγεγονότων προφητῶν πάντας ἀνατάξασθαι λόγους, καὶ ἀποκαταστῆσαι τῷ λαῷ τὴν διὰ Μωσέως νομοθεσίαν.* Blass would press this meaning here and interpret as 'to reconstruct' the material which had come down by tradition. But the verb has not this force in Aristeas 144, and here prob. the word is an equivalent for the more usual *συντάσσεσθαι. ἀναγραφή, ἀναγράφειν* are found similarly almost interchangeable with *συγγραφή, συγγράφειν* (Diod. Sic. v. 1, 4; Arrian i. 1).

*περὶ τῶν . . . πραγμάτων*] On the assumption that the Preface is a Preface to the whole work (see above) *ἐν ἡμῖν* is considerably easier than if it be taken as Preface to the Gospel alone. With the works and words and resurrection of Jesus, the expansion of the Church is to be included among the *πράγματα πεπληροφορημένα.*

*πεπληροφορημένων*] *πληροφορεῖν* may mean 'to convince' (cf. Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5; Col. iv. 12), but the passive can scarcely be made to mean 'to be surely believed' (Orig. al. A.V.). The word is here the equivalent of *πληρόω* 'to fulfil.' Cf. Col. iv. 17 *βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς* with 2 Tim. iv. 5 *τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον. πληροφορεῖν* is perhaps preferred to *πληροῦν* on account of its length.

2 καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέ-
3 ται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι

2 καθως] καθα D Eus (hist eccl 3. 4 ; dem p. 120)

2. καθώς] Found occasionally in later Greek prose writers. Very freq. in N.T. Censured by Phryn. cccxcvii. who approves καθά, read by D and Eus. in this place.

παρέδοσαν] The good Attic form of the aor. in the plur. indic. Cf. Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 220. Elsewhere in N.T. the plural, like the singular, is formed from the aorist in κ, e.g. Lk. xxiv. 20, 42; Acts i. 26, iii. 13, xv. 30. The word does not *necessarily* connote oral tradition. See Acts vi. 14 τὰ ἔθη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς; Justin, *Apol.* i. 66 οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν. It is, however, natural to interpret the word of tradition, primarily oral, of which the writers, referred to above, had made use. The πολλοί and the αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου are treated as distinct classes, though nothing forbids the supposition that some of the latter class were also to be found among the former. Cadbury (*op. cit.* p. 497) goes too far in saying that Mark "was declared by this very writer to be a ὑπηρέτης λόγου," for in Acts xiii. 5 ὑπηρέτης clearly means a personal attendant. But the author would probably have reckoned him to be such.

οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς . . . τοῦ λόγου] The phrase is to be taken together. αὐτόπται and ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου need not be distinguished into separate classes, but not all of the persons included need be assumed to have satisfied all the elements in the description. ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς and γενόμενοι are prob. best construed with the phrase as a whole, τοῦ λόγου goes closely with ὑπηρέται; cf. Acts vi. 4 τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου, Gal. vi. 6 ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον. λόγος then means 'the word of God.' The material of the narratives referred to depended upon eye-witnesses and active participants in the preaching of the word from the beginning. Unlike a modern historian, an ancient historian is not always careful to name his sources, but he is naturally anxious to assure his readers that he is well informed. So Thuc. i. 22 and frequently in later historians; cf. Cadbury, *ad loc.*, Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 315 f. Cadbury speaks of such reference as a 'convention,' but an ancient writer would no more claim the authority of eye-witnesses without expecting his statement to be believed than a modern. Cf. Colson, *J.Th.S.* xxiv. (1923) pp. 300 f.

ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς] The beginning of the Christian movement was generally reckoned from the preaching of John. Cf. Acts i. 21 f., x. 37; Mk. i. 1, and the elaborate synchronism Luke iii. 1.

3. παρηκολουθηκότι] The verb means 'to follow,' 'to keep touch with,' either literally, as in *C. Apion.* i. 10 where παρηκολουθηκότα τοῖς γεγονόσιν contrasts with παρὰ τῶν εἰδότων πυνθανόμενον, or metaphorically, by study and enquiry, as in Dem. *De cor.* § 172, p. 285. Luke was not an αὐτόπτης for the ministry of Jesus at any rate, and the latter meaning must therefore be included here. The word does not itself mean 'to investigate,' but if one who was not himself αὐτόπτης is said to have followed accurately a course of events, in-

ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. 4

vestigation must be implied. The rhythm and balance of the sentence require that ἀκριβῶς should be taken with παρηκολουθηκότι, and not, as by Cadbury, with γράψαι.

ἄνωθεν] Not to be sharply distinguished in meaning from ἀπ' ἀρχῆς above. Cf. Acts xxvi. 4, 5. But Luke will not intend to exclude the events narrated in *cc.* i., ii.

πᾶσιν] Neut. 'all the events.'

καθεξῆς] Peculiar to Luke in Greek Bible (viii. 1; Acts iii. 24, xi. 4, xviii. 23). Found also in *Test. XII. Patr.*, Jud. xxv.; 1 Clem. xxxvii. 3; Plut. *Symp.* i. 1. 5. Luke intends to give a *continuous* narrative. Chronological order was probably in his mind.

Θεόφιλε] Cf. Acts i. 1. A common proper name from the third cent. B.C. For references to lit. see Cadbury, *ad loc.* Theophilus cannot be identified, but there is no reason to doubt that he was a real person.

4. ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς . . . τὴν ἀσφάλειαν] 'that you may receive sure information.' The meaning is probably not different from γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλές (Acts xxi. 34, xxii. 30), ἐπιγνῶναι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν being perhaps here preferred for reasons of euphony. No exact parallel is quoted to the use of the abstract noun ἀσφάλεια as a virtual equivalent for τὸ ἀσφαλές in its well-attested sense of 'that which may be relied upon' (cf. Colson, *J.Th.S.* xxiv. p. 303), but the use of ἀλήθεια and other abstract nouns in a concrete sense is frequent. Ropes (*J.Th.S.* xxv. p. 69) appositely quotes 1 Cor. xiii. 2 εἰδέναι πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν where τὴν γνῶσιν virtually means τὸ γνωστόν, and Antiph. *Orat.* i. 13 (p. 112. 43 f.) ἔφευγον τῶν πραχθέντων τὴν σαφήνειαν πυθέσθαι 'to learn the plain truth.' To give τὴν ἀσφάλειαν the meaning of 'the quality of certainty' fits the sense less well. The work does not merely prove or authenticate what Theophilus has already learnt; rather it conveys in a permanent and assured form what he has previously learnt in a less systematic manner.

κατηχήθης] On the history and meaning of this word cf. Burton on Gal. vi. 6. In Acts xxi. 21, 24 the word is used of hostile reports concerning Paul. Cadbury prefers to think that hostile reports are referred to here: Theophilus is an influential non-Christian, and the work is written with the intention of meeting incriminating reports. For a criticism of this view (favoured by the editors of *The Beginnings*), see Colson, *l.c.* It is more probable that κατηχεῖν here, as in Acts xviii. 25, Rom. ii. 18, 1 Cor. xiv. 19, Gal. vi. 6, refers to Christian instruction, and that Theophilus was a professed Christian of good standing. That he is addressed as κράτιστε is hardly decisive against his being a member of the Christian brotherhood. On the other hand, he may have been an interested outsider, in which case κατηχήθης will refer to information received, not to instruction in the faith.

περὶ ὧν λόγων] Idiomatic attraction of the antecedent into the relative clause. Probably it represents περὶ τῶν λόγων οὓς (cf. Acts xviii. 25, xxi. 24, where ὧν represents accus. attracted to case of antecedent); or possibly τῶν λόγων περὶ ὧν, cf. Ps.-Plut. *De fluv.* viii. 1 κατηχηθεὶς δὲ περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων (ed. Bernadikis, vol. vii. p. 296).

### The Births of John Baptist and Jesus Christ (cc. i., ii.)

The narrative begins with accounts of the births of Jesus and of his forerunner, the Baptist. The first canonical Gospel has similarly expanded the Marcan type of gospel by carrying back the beginning from the Baptism of Jesus to his Birth; but the Matthaean introduction—which contains no reference to the birth of the Baptist—differs in spirit profoundly from the Lucan, and not a little in historical detail. Both agree that Jesus was born at Bethlehem of a virgin mother, but whereas in Luke, Joseph and Mary are natives of Nazareth (ii. 39), who make a special journey to Bethlehem at the time of the birth of Jesus and return to Nazareth after the presentation of Jesus in the Temple, in Matthew, Joseph appears to be a native of Judaea (ii. 22) who only settles at Nazareth in Galilee with Mary his wife when, after returning from Egypt, he hears that Herod's son Archelaus has taken the place of his father Herod. In Matthew fulfilments of Messianic prophecy and the escape of the Messiah from his earthly enemy King Herod are controlling ideas. These do not appear in Luke, who gives a group of idyllic scenes, conceived in the spirit and expressed in the language of Old Testament narrative.

The two chapters as they stand consist of a series of some seven scenes in which the annunciation to Zacharias and the birth of John balance the annunciation to Mary and the birth of Jesus:

| | |
|---|---|
| i. 5-25. The annunciation of the birth of John to Zacharias. | i. 26-38. The annunciation of the birth of Jesus to Mary. |
| i. 39-56. The meeting of Mary with Elizabeth, the wife of Zacharias. | |
| i. 57-80. The birth and circumcision of John, followed by the prophetic greeting of Zacharias to his son. | ii. 1-40. The birth and circumcision of Jesus, followed by the prophetic greetings of Simeon and Anna, when the infant is presented in the Temple. |
| ii. 41-52. An incident in the boyhood of Jesus breaks the interval between the infancy and the public ministry of the Lord. | |

Nothing is known as to the source of these narratives, and very different theories have been propounded. Many critics hold that they are based upon a written Semitic source, possibly Hebrew (so Resch, 'Das Kindheitsevangelium,' *T.u.U.* x. 5 (1897), pp. 29 f.; Gunkel, *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis d. N.T.* pp. 67 f.; De Lagarde, *Mitth.* iii. 345), but more probably Aramaic (Plummer, Bousset, Gressmann). Gressmann (in Klostermann) suspects mistranslation of an Aramaic original as the explanation of some obscurities in the present Greek text (i. 17, 25, 49, 51; ii. 11). It must always be precarious to argue from the presumed text of a lost original. The elucidations proposed by Gressmann are in no case essential to the sense, and do not provide any decisive confirmation of the theory of an Aramaic source. Others, e.g. Harnack, explain the Semitisms as due to direct imitation of the LXX, and regard the whole as a free composition by the evangelist himself. "The Hebraisms, whether adopted or inserted from the Old Testament, are *intentional*; the whole style is artificial, and is intended to produce an impression of antiquity—a purpose which has been really fulfilled" (Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, E.T., p. 217; cf. *Berl. Sitz. Ber.*, 1900, xxvii.). Parallels, close and frequent, to the language of the LXX are noted below, as well as resemblances to phraseology found elsewhere in the Lucan writings. But it is probable that the evangelist was not the first to conceive pictures of the infancy of John and of Jesus and that he has made use of earlier accounts, whether written or oral, refashioning them to a greater or less extent, as he has done the rest of his material. J. Weiss (*Das Urchristentum*, pp. 564 f.) thinks of the stories as circulating among Palestinian Christians after A.D. 70. The sympathetic portrayal of national Messianic hopes, the familiarity with Jewish sentiment in respect of the misfortune of childlessness, and the generally accurate acquaintance with the usages of the Jewish priesthood at the Temple, are in favour of a Palestinian origin for the stories which Luke has utilised.

Norden (*Die Geburt des Kindes*, pp. 102 f.) adopts the theory propounded by Völter (*Die evangelischen Erzählungen von der Geburt u. Kindheit Jesu*, Strassburg, 1911), that the original nucleus of these chapters dealt only with the birth of the Baptist (i. 5-25, 41-80) and emanated from the community of the Baptist's disciples; the narratives of the annunciation to Mary and the circumstances attending and following upon the birth of Jesus were modelled upon and adapted to the earlier source. In the earlier source the angel Gabriel was sent 'in the sixth month' (i. 26), not to Mary, but to Elizabeth, and it was at the angel's salutation that the babe first leaped in the womb of Elizabeth. The angel then revealed to Elizabeth—as in the present narrative she reveals to Mary—the name of her son that is to be born. This would explain how Elizabeth knows (*v.* 60) by what name her child is to be called. The theory is supported by the singular absence of Christian ideas in the sections relating to John. Only at the meeting of Elizabeth and Mary (on this theory due to the later editor) and in the later verses of the Benedictus is the subordination of John to his greater successor hinted at. The words of Gabriel to Zacharias are Jewish, not Christian, in their outlook. John is to be the Messenger of Malachi, not the forerunner of the Messiah. Völter holds that the Benedictus in its present form has been expanded by the Christian editor:

the reference to 'the horn of salvation' which God has raised up 'in the house of his servant David,' and the closing reference to the approaching Messianic salvation are interpolations; the original hymn consisted only of *vv.* 68, 71-75.

The dismemberment of the Benedictus, however, is not very convincing. The omission of *vv.* 69, 70 would, it is true, avoid the parenthesis of *v.* 70 between *v.* 69 and the accusative σωτηρίαν in *v.* 71, but *v.* 69 comes in with great appropriateness in the present text after the opening verse, and, if we are unwilling to conjecture that *vv.* 69, 70 are interpolated, we must, as Völter sees, suppose that Zacharias knew his wife's kinswoman to be the destined mother of the heir to David's throne. The Benedictus as it stands links together the mission of John and the mission of Jesus. Moreover, the unity of style and the close similarity in structure between the account of the appearance of Gabriel to Zacharias and his appearance to Mary tell in favour of the hypothesis that a single hand is responsible for both the annunciations as we read them. Norden lays stress upon 'the sixth month,' *v.* 26. This, he urges, is explained if the narrative originally referred to Elizabeth, for it is in the sixth month that the first movements of the unborn babe occur. This may well be the true explanation why the date is mentioned, and it may still be adopted, if the narratives are all held to be of a piece; for Mary, in the text (*v.* 39), arose and went after the annunciation 'with haste' to visit her kinswoman. No considerable interval of time elapses, and 'the sixth month' governs the whole narrative down to *v.* 56.

5 ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἱερεύς τις ὀνόματι Ζαχαρίας ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιά, καὶ γυνὴ αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρών, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα*

5. Ἡρῴδου βασίλεως τῆς Ἰουδαίας] Cf. Mt. ii. 1. Herod the Great was made King of the Jews by M. Antonius 40 B.C., and died 4 B.C. Ἰουδαία here, as freq. in Luke, includes the whole of Palestine. Cf. iv. 44, vi. 17, vii. 17, xxiii. 5; Acts x. 37. For the restricted meaning see *v.* 65 *infra*.

ἱερεύς τις] In *Protev. Jac.* viii. Zacharias is transformed into the High Priest.

ὀνόματι Ζαχαρίας] A not uncommon Jewish name. See Josephus, *Index*.

ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιά] The eighth of the twenty-four classes into which the priests were divided (1 Chron. xxiv. 10). The distribution of the priests into classes (ἐφημερίαι LXX 1 Chron. xxviii. 13; ἐφημερίδες πατριαί Joseph.) ascribed to David was still in force at the time of Josephus (*Ant.* vii. 14. 7). Each course in turn came up to Jerusalem for a week's service at the Temple. Cf. Schürer, ii. pp. 286 f.

ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρών] The Priests were required by the Law

αὐτῆς Ἐλεισάβετ. ἦσαν δὲ δίκαιοι ἀμφότεροι ἐναντίον τοῦ 6
θεοῦ πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασιν
τοῦ κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι. καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τέκνον, καθότι 7
ἦν [ἡ] Ἐλεισάβετ στεῖρα, καὶ ἀμφότεροι προβεβηκότες
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν ἦσαν. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν 8
τῷ ἱερατεύειν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ τάξει τῆς ἐφημερίας αὐτοῦ
ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἱερατίας ἔλαχε τοῦ θυ- 9
μιᾶσαι εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ πᾶν τὸ 10

7 η Ελεισαβετ om η B 69 al pauc

(Lev. xxi. 14) to marry virgins of Israelitish birth, but they were not restricted to priestly families.

Ἐλεισάβετ] The name of Aaron's wife (Ex. vi. 23).

In style and vocabulary the verse recalls Ju. xiii. 2 καὶ ἦν ἀνὴρ εἷς ἀπὸ Σαρὰλ ἀπὸ δήμου συγγενείας τοῦ Δανεί, καὶ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Μανῶε, καὶ γυνὴ αὐτῷ στεῖρα καὶ οὐκ ἔτεκεν.

6. δίκαιοι . . . ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ] In the unreflective sense of the O.T. (e.g. Gen. vii. 1 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Νῶε . . . σὲ ἴδον δίκαιον ἐναντίον μου) explained by the words that follow, πορευόμενοι . . . τοῦ κυρίου, for which cf. Gen. xxvi. 5; Num. xxxvi. 13; Deut. iv. 40.

ἄμεμπτοι] They had fulfilled all, so that no fault could be found. Cf. Phil. iii. 6.

7. Like Abraham and Sarah they had no child, and like A. and S. they were old; Gen. xviii. 11 Ἀβραὰμ δὲ καὶ Σάρρα πρεσβύτεροι προβεβηκότες ἡμερῶν. καθότι Lucan only in N.T. In Acts ii. 45, iv. 35, it is used in its correct sense: 'according as'; here, as often in later Gk., it is equivalent to διότι. Blass, § 78. 6.

8. ἐγένετο δέ] Very freq. in Lk. corresponding to the Heb. וַיְהִי. It is used with three constructions: (1) foll. by another vb. in indic. as ἔλαχε here. Freq. in Gospel (esp. in cc. i., ii.). Not in Acts. Freq. in LXX; (2) foll. by καί and another vb. in indic., αὐτός or αὐτοί usu. following καί. Freq. in Gospel. In Acts only v. 7, and there doubtful. Freq. in LXX; (3) foll. by infin. like Gk. συνέβη: iii. 21; vi. 1, 12; xvi. 22. Freq. in Acts. All the Lucan exx. are collected Plummer p. 45. The וַיְהִי construction is used when "there is a clause specifying the circumstances under which an action takes place" (Driver). This also satisfies Lucan usage except sometimes, e.g. xvi. 22, in the non-Hebraic constr. (3). Cf. Moulton, *Prol.* p. 16. The idiom occurs rarely in Mark and Matthew apart from the formula ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν κτλ., constr. (1), which closes in Mt. each of the five great bodies of teaching. There is no corresponding constr. in Aramaic. The occurrence of the phrase in the N.T. is therefore a sign of the influence of Hebrew, and probably of Biblical, idiom.

9. κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἱερατίας] Best taken with ἔλαχε. It was decided by lot which priest should offer the incense. Cf. Mishna, *Tamid*, and Schürer, ii. pp. 351 f.

εἰσελθών goes with θυμιᾶσαι.

εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου] The chosen priest enters the ναός, the building which contained the Holy of Holies,

πλῆθος ἦν τοῦ λαοῦ προσευχόμενον ἔξω τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ θυ-
11 μιάματος· ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἑστὼς ἐκ δεξιῶν
12 τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ θυμιάματος. καὶ ἐταράχθη Ζαχα-
13 ρίας ἰδών, καὶ φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς
αὐτὸν ὁ ἄγγελος Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ζαχαρία, διότι εἰσηκούσθη
ἡ δέησίς σου, καὶ ἡ γυνή σου Ἐλεισάβετ γεννήσει υἱόν
14 σοι, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάνην· καὶ ἔσται χαρά
σοι καὶ ἀγαλλίασις, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ χα-
15 ρήσονται· ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, καὶ οἶνον
καὶ ϲίκερα οὐ μὴ πίῃ, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται

and Holy Place, to be dist. from τὸ ἱερόν, the whole temple area.

10. τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ θυμιάματος] Incense was burnt twice a day, before the morning and after the evening sacrifice. Philo, *De victimis* 3 δὶς δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐπιθυμιᾶται τὰ πάντων εὐωδέστατα θυμιαμάτων εἴσω τοῦ καταπετάσματος ἀνίσχοντος ἡλίου καὶ δυομένου, πρό τε τῆς ἑωθινῆς θυσίας καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἑσπερίνην. The number of people in attendance is perhaps an indication that the evening offering is here thought of. Cf. Dan. ix. 21.

11. ὤφθη δὲ . . . Κυρίου] Cf. Ju. xiii. 3. It was on a similar occasion that John Hyrcanus (135–104 B.C.) received the divine communication that his sons had conquered Antiochus, which he forthwith announced to the multitude without (Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 10. 3). Cf. also, for a divine manifestation at an offering, Wenamon's journey to Phoenicia, Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte u. Bilder*, i. 226.

13. Μὴ φοβοῦ] A typical address of a supernatural being to a frightened man. Cf. Ju. vi. 23; Dan. x. 12, 19; Mk. vi. 50; Mt. xxviii. 10; Rev. i. 17; Hom. *Il.* xxiv. 171.

ἡ δέησίς σου] We were not told that Z. was praying for a son in his old age, and his incredulity, *v.* 18, does not readily suit these words of the angel. It is a mistake to look for close consistency in narratives of this character. Cf. *v.* 34. The difficulty here has often been met (e.g. by Chrys., Plummer, Lagrange) by supposing that the prayer of Z. had been for the redemption of Israel. This is too subtle. The following words imply that he had prayed for a son. The 'joy' of Z. and of 'many' is to follow upon the answer to Z.'s prayer. The language again is closely reminiscent of the LXX. Cf. Gen. xviii. 10; Ju. xiii. 24.

15. ἐνώπιον] A favourite prep. with Lk. (22 times in Gosp., 13 in Acts). Exc. Jo. xx. 30 not in other Gospels. In Paul in confessions 'before God' 'before men.' Freq. in Rev. and in LXX. Also attested for the vernacular by papyri from the third cent. B.C. onwards. But the frequency of its occurrence in Luke may be set down to the influence of LXX, where it is in regular use for לִפְנֵי. Cf. Introd. p. lxxix.

οἶνον καὶ σίκερα] In Ju. xiii. fermented drink is forbidden to the mother, but in LXX (*v.* 14) also to the son. There is here no mention

ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ 16
ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ Κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν· καὶ αὐτὸς προ- 17
ελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἠλεία,
ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει
δικαίων, ἑτοιμάσαι Κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον. καὶ εἶπεν
Ζαχαρίας πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον Κατὰ τί γνώσομαι τοῦτο; ἐγὼ 18
γάρ εἰμι πρεσβύτης καὶ ἡ γυνή μου προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ταῖς
ἡμέραις αὐτῆς. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῷ 19
Ἐγώ εἰμι Γαβριὴλ ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ

17 προελευσεται] προσελευσεται B*CL *al*

of allowing the hair to grow. John therefore was not to be a Nazirite. A certain contrast between strong drink and the holy spirit is probably to be felt. Cf. Eph. v. 18 καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία, ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι.

ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ] A Hebraism. It may be questioned whether this means ‘from birth,’ as ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 11, or ‘while still in the womb,’ as appar. Ju. xiii. 7; Is. xlix. 5. The latter is the interpr. of syr.sin and of the ancients generally. ἔτι is slightly in its favour, and it is perhaps supported by *vv.* 41, 44.

17. The angel's words are founded upon Mal. iii. 1 and iv. 4, 5. Cf. the use of the latter passage in Ecclus. xlviii. 10.

ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ] i.e. Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. There is no mention of Messiah. The angel does not go beyond Malachi. ἐν πνεύματι . . . Ἠλείᾳ] John is not directly said to *be* Elijah, as in Mt. xi. 14; Mk. ix. 13 (omitted at Lk. ix. 37). In Jo. i. 21 the Baptist declares that he is not Elijah. ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας . . . τέκνα] The quotation is nearer to the Heb. than to LXX, but the complementary clause ‘to turn the hearts of the children to the fathers’ is omitted in favour of a further interpretation. It seems best to understand the saying literally of family relations, as in Mal., rather than, with Loisy, to interpret πάτερες of the pious patriarchs, and ἀπειθεῖς of the disobedient sons of the present generation. ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων] i.e. that they may walk in the wisdom of the just. ἐν is not misused for εἰς. Blass, § 41. 1. ἑτοιμάσαι] Dep. on, not co-ordinate with, ἐπιστρέψαι. ‘To make ready for the Lord a people well prepared’; i.e. for the coming of God's reign. κατεσκευασμένον] Gressmann (in Klostermann) suggests that this represents Aram. תקין which means not only ‘prepared,’ but ‘just,’ ‘good.’

18. Cf. Gen. xv. 8 εἶπεν δὲ [Ἀβράμ] Δέσποτα Κύριε, κατὰ τί γνώσομαι . . .; Gen. xviii. 11 Ἀβραὰμ δὲ καὶ Σάρρα πρεσβύτεροι προβεβηκότες ἡμερῶν.

19. Γαβριήλ] The angel who made revelations to Daniel (cc. ix., x.). ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ] This might be said of angelic beings in general (Job i. 6); but here it probably marks out Gabriel as one of a special class: cf. Tobit xii. 15 ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Ῥαφαήλ, εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ

ἀπεστάλην λαλῆσαι πρὸς σὲ καὶ εὐαγγελίσασθαί σοι ταῦτα·
20 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔσῃ σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι ἄχρι ἧς
ἡμέρας γένηται ταῦτα, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστευσας τοῖς λόγοις
21 μου, οἵτινες πληρωθήσονται εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν. καὶ ἦν
ὁ λαὸς προσδοκῶν τὸν Ζαχαρίαν, καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐν τῷ
22 χρονίζειν ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτόν. ἐξελθὼν δὲ οὐκ ἐδύνατο λαλῆσαι
αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν ὅτι ὀπτασίαν ἑώρακεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ· καὶ
23 αὐτὸς ἦν διανεύων αὐτοῖς, καὶ διέμενεν κωφός. Καὶ ἐγένετο
ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπῆλθεν
24 εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας
συνέλαβεν Ἐλεισάβετ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ· καὶ περιέκρυβεν ἑαυτὴν

ἁγίων ἀγγέλων οἳ προσαναφέρουσι τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ εἰσπορεύονται ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου; Rev. i. 4; Enoch xl.; and see Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.* pp. 325 f.

20. σιωπῶν] Here, as in 4 Macc. x. 18, virtually an adj. For the combination of positive and negative statement cf. Acts xiii. 11 ἔσῃ τυφλός, μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον ἄχρι καιροῦ. Common in Heb. lit.

οἵτινες] Slightly stronger than οἵ. It gives a qualitative force to the clause: "Thou hast not believed my words, which nevertheless [deserved credence for they] shall receive their due fulfilment."

εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν] Not to be dist. from ἐν τῷ καιρῷ αὐτῶν.

21. Zacharias is clearly thought of as being alone in the Holy Place. According to the Mishna, *Tamid* vii. 2, five priests were engaged together in the Holy Place at the time of the offering of incense, and together came out and blessed the people.

22. When Zacharias came out of the Temple, he was unable to speak. He would therefore be incapable of fulfilling his office of blessing the waiting people. But the blessing is not directly alluded to. ἐπέγνωσαν ὅτι κτλ.] The people are at once able to assign the true cause for the priest's dumbness. It was the natural effect of a supernatural vision. Cf. Daniel x. 7 f., esp. *v.* 15, καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν λαλῆσαι μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὰ προστάγματα ταῦτα ἔδωκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐσιώπησα. καὶ ἰδοὺ ὡς ὁμοίωσις χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου ἥψατο μου τῶν χειλέων· καὶ ἤνοιξα τὸ στόμα μου καὶ ἐλάλησα.

23. Zacharias returns home when the week's residence of his course is ended. Cf. *v.* 5 n.

24. It is not clear why Elizabeth hid herself for the five months. No such custom seems to be known. We may perhaps suppose that the elderly woman does not wish to court comment, although ancient sentiment was not inclined to reticence in such circumstances. Or she may retire in order to give herself to thankful devotion (J. Weiss), as the next verse may be intended to suggest. Perhaps, however, the explanation is to be sought in the necessities of the narrative (so Klostermann). The pregnancy of Elizabeth is to be first announced by the angel to Mary in the sixth month. The retirement of Elizabeth

*μῆνας πέντε, λέγουσα ὅτι Οὕτως μοι πεποίηκεν Κύριος ἐν* 25
*ἡμέραις αἷς ἐπεῖδεν ἀφελεῖν ὄνειδός μου ἐν ἀνθρώποις.*

will explain why the news has not reached her young kinswoman before.

25. Elizabeth, like the holy women of old, rejoices that the shame of childlessness has been removed from her.

*οὕτως μοι πεποίηκεν . . . ἐν ἀνθρώποις*] Cf. Gen. xxi. 6 *εἶπεν δὲ Σάρρα Γέλωτά μοι ἐποίησεν Κύριος*, xxx. 23 *εἶπεν δὲ Ῥαχήλ Ἀφεῖλεν ὁ θεός μου τὸ ὄνειδος*. But these utterances are ascribed to the wives of the patriarchs after the births of their children, not, as here, after conception.

## The Annunciation (i. 26-38)

The annunciation to Mary of the birth of Jesus is a counterpart to the annunciation to Zacharias of the birth of John. In spite of significant differences, the similarity in structure between the two narratives is close. The appearance of Gabriel to Zacharias (*v.* 11) is balanced by Gabriel's appearance and salutation to Mary (*v.* 28). Like Zacharias (*v.* 12) Mary (*v.* 29) is distressed. Mary (*v.* 30) like Zacharias (*v.* 13) receives from the angel a reassurance and the promise of a son. Like Zacharias (*v.* 18) she expresses a doubt as to how this can be (*v.* 34). And like Zacharias (*v.* 19) she receives from the angel an answer to her doubts (*v.* 35 f.).

When pressed the narrative of the Annunciation is found to be wanting in cohesion. Mary betrothed to Joseph, a scion of the royal line, is to bear an heir to David's throne, 'of whose kingdom there shall be no end,' but Mary is to bear her son, not by a man, but by the power of God's Spirit. Two ideas lie here side by side, and they are not reconciled. The sonship of Jesus to Joseph is essential to the former idea, and is ruled out by the second. It is the same discrepancy which will necessitate the distorting interpolation at the beginning of the genealogy in *c.* iii.: Jesus was the son of Joseph, *ὡς ἐνομίζετο*.

Some critics (e.g. Streeter, Harnack) have sought to ease the difficulty by the hypothesis of interpolation. The only words in this Gospel which involve the idea of conception without a human father are the patent interpolation of the evangelist at iii. 23 and the two verses 34 and 35 in this section. *b* omits the words *πῶς ἔσται . . . γινώσκω* and transfers the answer of Mary, *Ecce ancilla Domini* . . . (*v.* 38), to this place. *b* is supported by *e* in omitting the latter sentence at *v.* 38. It has been argued that this may reflect an earlier form of text in which conception by Mary as virgin was not implied.

But the unsupported testimony of *b* for omission is not strong textual evidence,[1] and there are other reasons for hesitation in respect of a theory of simple interpolation, whether of *v.* 34 alone or of *vv.* 34 and 35. If Mary's hesitating question is omitted we destroy the parallelism in structure between the two annunciations. Moreover, although a tolerable meaning would be left in the remaining verses, several fine points would be destroyed:

(i.) The opening salutation would lose something in appropriateness if the succeeding narrative were not to foretell the peculiar part which Mary was to play.

(ii.) More serious would be the weakening of Mary's concluding words (*v.* 38). They are a fitting response to the prophecy that the Holy Spirit is to come upon her, but they would have no special point if the Annunciation had been confined to the destiny of Mary's son.

(iii.) The reference to Elizabeth's miraculous conception comes in well after the prophecy of *v.* 35. It would make a less appropriate sequel to *v.* 33.

A simple theory of interpolation, therefore, seems not satisfactory. The narrative as a whole coheres with *vv.* 34, 35, and it is maimed by their exclusion.

But while recognising the literary unity of the present text, it is plausible to conjecture that an earlier and unrecoverable form of the Annunciation in which Jesus was assumed to be the son of Joseph may lie behind it. The first narrators who spoke of Mary as affianced or wedded to Joseph 'of the house of David' may be supposed to have thought of Jesus as Joseph's son.[2] And in the Lucan narratives of *c.* ii. there is no care to mark that Joseph was not the father. At ii. 5 Mary (according to the reading of syr.sin, lat.vt) is spoken of simply as Joseph's wife. At ii. 27, 41 Mary and Joseph are γονεῖς. And again at ii. 48 we read ὁ πατήρ σου καὶ ἐγώ.

So far as we know the idea of conception without a human father was unknown in orthodox Judaism. But it was widely prevalent in the ancient world.[3] Plato's own nephew Speusippos could relate that the story went in

---

[1] Possibly the scribe of *b* preferred to think that Mary would at once express her acceptance of the angel's message, rather than betray the hesitation which is implied in the regular text of *v.* 34. In any case the crucial verse 35 stands in *b* as in all other MSS. and versions.

[2] Norden (*Die Geburt des Kindes*, p. 81) wishes to derive the double position of Mary as wife and virgin mother from a traditional Egyptian *motif* of the woman who was at once bride to the God and wife to a human husband. I cannot think that this is at all likely.

[3] Cf. Usener, *Weihnachtsfest*, pp. 70 f.

Athens that his uncle was the child of Perictione by Apollo.[1] The stories of the miraculous births of Alexander, the elder Scipio, Augustus, are familiar. That it was natural to expect supernatural birth in the case of a religious leader is illustrated by the claim put into the mouth of Simon Magus that his mother Rachel conceived him as a virgin before she and Antonius came together.[2] Thus when the Church moved out into the Hellenistic world of Caesarea, Antioch, and beyond, it would be very natural that cognate ideas concerning the manner of the conception of Jesus should find a lodgement, while at the same time the governing monotheistic belief would reject gross conceptions of divine paternity. Both Matthew and Luke represent the conception of Jesus as due to the operation of the Spirit of God upon Mary, while she was still virgin.

Perhaps we may here follow Norden[3] in tracing a special affiliation with Egyptian ideas. Plutarch, *Num.* 4, gives it as an Egyptian belief that it is not impossible for the Spirit of God to draw near to a woman and to beget in her the beginnings of birth (*γυναικὶ μὲν οὐκ ἀδύνατον πνεῦμα πλησιάσαι θεοῦ καί τινας ἐντεκεῖν ἀρχὰς γενέσεως*). Elsewhere (*De Isid. et Osir.* 36) Plutarch says that the Egyptians call *πνεῦμα* (‘breath’ or ‘wind’) Zeus, i.e. Amon. And this is confirmed by some original Egyptian texts. This belief in the possibility of conceiving by *πνεῦμα*, Norden thinks, has been crossed by a Hellenistic exaltation of the idea of virginity, such as is found e.g. in Philo, *De Cher.* xii.-xv. Philo, be it noted, uses virginity in a spiritual, not a literal sense, and has no idea of a virgin birth.

Norden goes further and argues that the story of the Annunciation represents a monotheistic and Christian refinement of the old Egyptian myth that the reigning Pharaoh is the offspring of the Sun-god Amon-Re and the Queen. He gives a parallel to the angelic Annunciation from a fourth-century Greek astrological writer Hephaestion, whose works betray no sign of Christian influence. Hephaestion speaks of a child who is to be born under the influence of a certain constellation in these words[4]: *ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τρίτου* (sc. *δεκανοῦ τοῦ Ὑδροχόου*) *γεννώμενος ἐκ θεῶν σπαρήσεται, καὶ*

---

[1] Diog. Laert. iii. 2; Jer. *Adv. Jovin.* i. 42 (Migne, *P.L.* xxiii. p. 275); cf. Orig. *C. Cels.* i. 37 *οὐδὲν δ᾽ ἄτοπον πρὸς Ἕλληνας καὶ Ἑλληνικαῖς ἱστοριαῖς χρήσασθαι, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶμεν μόνοι τῇ παραδόξῳ ἱστορίᾳ ταύτῃ* (i.e. virgin birth) *κεχρῆσθαι. ἔδοξε γάρ τισιν οὐ περὶ ἀρχαίων τινῶν ἱστοριῶν καὶ ἡρωϊκῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περί τινων χθὲς καὶ πρώην γενομένων, ἀναγράψαι ὡς δύνατον ὅτι καὶ Πλάτων ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀμφικτιόνης γέγονε, κωλυθέντος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος αὐτῇ συνελθεῖν, ἕως ἀποκυήσει τὸν ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος σπαρέντα.*

[2] Clem. *Recogn.* ii. 14.

[3] *Geburt des Kindes*, pp. 76 f.

[4] Hephaestion, p. 65. 17 (ed. Engelbrecht).

*ἔσται μέγας καὶ μετὰ θεῶν θρησκευθήσεται καὶ ἔσται κοσμοκράτωρ καὶ πάντα αὐτῷ ὑπακούσεται.* Purge this of its polytheism, introduce the Hebraic colouring—'the throne of David,' 'the house of Jacob'—and the distance is not great from the Christian Annunciation—divine birth, 'he shall be great,' 'all things shall obey him.' With these are to be grouped the divine child of Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue*, and the Immanuel prophecy of Isaiah vii. All four Norden holds to be variations of the Egyptian theme of the divine child Horus.

In his exposition of our text Norden perhaps lays himself open to the criticism that he emphasises insufficiently the direct and certain relations of the angelic Annunciation with the language of Isaiah ix. Even if it be true that Egypt provided a background of ideas and forms both to Isaiah and to the Gospel story, yet there remains an inner historical relation between the prophet and the Gospel. Egypt is not the uniting link between Isaiah and Luke, even if Egypt has exercised influence upon both. The link is the Church-nation of the Jews of which from the very outset Jesus was regarded as Messianic King. In the Lucan Annunciation we seem to have moved beyond the primitive Judaeo-Christian world of thought, yet in Luke too the Isaianic text is central, not peripheral.

26 *Ἐν δὲ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ*
*ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ᾗ ὄνομα Ναζαρὲτ*
27 *πρὸς παρθένον ἐμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσὴφ ἐξ*

26. After an interval of six months Gabriel is again dispatched to earth to announce the coming birth of Jesus. He appears this time to the future mother. Throughout the infancy narratives of Luke the interest centres upon Mary. She plays the leading part and Joseph becomes a lay figure. This is in strong contrast with Matthew, where the angel appears to Joseph and Joseph throughout remains the chief actor.

27. *ἐξ οἴκου Δαυείδ*]. The order of the words in the sentence forbids the interpretation of Origen who wished to attach *ἐξ οἴκου Δαυείδ* to *παρθένον*. Moreover, had this been intended, for *τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου* we must have read *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς*. *τῆς παρθένου* shews that the preceding words qualify *ἀνδρί*, and that with *καὶ τὸ ὄνομα* we revert to the *παρθένον* already mentioned. The interpretation of Chrysostom who wished to attach *ἐξ οἴκου Δαυείδ* to both Joseph and Mary is equally impossible on grammatical grounds. It is Joseph who is of the house of David, and the claim of Jesus 'to sit upon the throne of his father David' rests upon the Davidic descent of Joseph. This is also the presupposition of the genealogies both in Matthew and in Luke. Nothing is said directly of Mary's lineage, but since, according to Luke, she is a kinswoman of Eliza-

οἴκου Δαυείδ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ. καὶ 28
εἰσελθὼν πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπεν Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος

beth, and Elizabeth was 'of the daughters of Aaron' (*v.* 5), it may probably be inferred that in this cycle of stories Mary too was of Levitic descent. Loisy conjectures that the sentence may originally have included a statement that Mary was 'of the daughters of Aaron,' which would have prepared the way for the statement of Gabriel in *v.* 36, and that this was sacrificed by a redactor who was conscious of the difficulty that if Mary was not of Davidic descent, and if Joseph was not the father, the Davidic descent of Jesus fell to the ground. Of course it might be supposed without inconsistency that Mary was in reality of Davidic descent on her father's side and was related to Elizabeth by her mother. The Davidic descent of Mary as well as of Joseph is asserted by syr.sin at ii. 4, 5 where the singular pronoun referring to Joseph is transformed into a plural: 'because both of them were of the house of David.' Similarly the *Protev. Jacobi* x. 1 makes Mary of Davidic descent, and this belief was widely held in the ancient Church.

28. χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη] The angelic salutation to Mary was early expanded by an interpolation from *v.* 42 into the full form which is found in the Vulgate and the Textus Receptus. See critical note. There is a play on the Greek words χαῖρε and κεχαριτωμένη. χαῖρε 'hail' (Lat. *Have*) is a Greek salutation. A Semite would say 'Peace to thee.' This is probably an indication that the narrative is not a mere reproduction of an Aramaic source, but has been written apart in Greek. Gressmann (in Klostermann), however, suggests that χαῖρε may be a literal translation of Aram. חַדִי 'rejoice,' not of שְׁלָם. The meaning would then be 'Rejoice, thou blessed one, for the Lord is helping thee.' Gressmann holds that this gives a better introduction to Mary's uncertainty and doubt in the next verse. But the interpretation of χαῖρε as a salutation is obvious in itself (cf. Mt. xxviii. 9), and makes a far more delicate opening to the dialogue than Gressmann's suggestion.

κεχαριτωμένη] The verb occurs elsewhere in N.T. only Eph. i. 6 τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ (τοῦ θεοῦ) ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ. The participle occurs in the Greek of Ecclus. of physical beauty (so some MSS. ix. 8, Swete εὐμόρφου), and of moral excellence (xviii. 17). It is clear that the word here refers to grace of character, 'Thou who hast been highly favoured by God.'

There are traces in ancient times of a view that the angel's utterance was itself the cause of the conception. Pseudo-Athan. εἰς τὸν εὐαγγελισμὸν τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου ii. 396E foll. ed. Bened. 1698 (quoted in Reitzenstein, *Zwei Religionsgesch. Fragen*, p. 120) refers to and rejects the view that the voice of the archangel was itself the substance of the Divine Word. A similar view lies behind *Sib. Orac.* viii. 461 κούρην αὐτάγγελος ἔννεπε φωνή. | "δέξαι ἐν ἀχράντοισι θεὸν σοῖς, παρθένε, κόλποις." | ὣς εἰπὼν ἔμπνευσε θεὸς χάριν. Cf. also *Protev. Jac.* xi. 2 ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐκ λόγου αὐτοῦ. This crude idea is not at all warranted by the Lucan text, as the futures in *v.* 35 ἐπελεύσεται, ἐπισκιάσει very clearly shew.

ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ] Cf. Ju. vi. 12

29 *μετὰ σοῦ. ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διεταράχθη καὶ διελογίζετο*
30 *ποταπὸς εἴη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ*
31 *Μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ, εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ἰδοὺ*
*συλλήμψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα*
32 *αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς Ὑψίστου*
*κληθήσεται, καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς* τὸν θρόνον Δαυεὶδ
33 *τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,* καὶ βασιλεύσει *ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακὼβ*
εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.*
34 *εἶπεν δὲ Μαριὰμ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον Πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ*

28 *μετα σου*] add *ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν* ACD al latt syrr (vg.hl) boh (codd) Eus (dem 329) Tert (virg vel 6) Protev Jac II. I (codd pler) ϛ om ℵBLΨ I-131 565 700 aegg arm pal Protev Jac (codd) add praeterea *και ευλογημενος ο καρπος της κοιλιας σου* 47 gat cf infra v. 42 34 *πως . . . γινωσκω*] b ecce ancilla domini contingat mihi secundum verbum tuum. cf ad v. 38

*καὶ ὤφθη αὐτῷ* (*Γεδεὼν*) *ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ.* Ruth ii. 4 *καὶ εἶπεν* (Βόος) *τοῖς θερίζουσι Κύριος μεθ' ὑμῶν.*

29. The maiden is disturbed at the angel's salutation. *εἴη*] Note optat. in indirect question—a characteristic feature of Lucan style.

30. *εὗρες γὰρ χάριν*] A Semitism, cf. Gen. vi. 8 *Νῶε δὲ εὗρεν χάριν ἐνάντιον Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ*, and freq.

31. *καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήμψῃ . . . Ἰησοῦν*] Cf. Gen. xvi. 11 *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου Ἰδοὺ σὺ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχεις, καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσμαήλ*, and Ju. xiii. 3, 5. Unlike Mt., Luke does not play on the etymological meaning of the name Jesus. In *Protev. Jac.* xi. 2 the words from Mt. i. 21 are introduced at the corresponding place in the narrative of the Annunciation.

32-33. Of John too it is said (*v.* 15) that 'he shall be great,' but the rôle of Jesus is to be other than that of John. *υἱὸς Ὑψίστου κληθήσεται*] As Davidic king of the house of Jacob, Jesus will be entitled 'Son of the Most High,' Ps. ii. 7, 2 Sam. vii. 14, Ps. lxxxix. 26, 27. The angelic message is a direct reminiscence of Is. ix. 6 f. *ὅτι παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, υἱὸς ἐδόθη ἡμῖν . . . ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον Δαυεὶδ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*

34. *πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο . . . γινώσκω ;*] On the textual evidence for the omission of these words see Introd. *supra*.

If Mary is already betrothed to Joseph, who is of the house of David, why should there be this difficulty or this particular hesitation in accepting the angel's prophecy? This obvious difficulty has been met in three ways: (1) It has been supposed that the angel's words were intended to indicate, and were understood by Mary to indicate, that the conception was to take place forthwith. This was the view of Cajetan: "*non dixit* non cognoscam *sed* non cognosco, quia intellexerat verba angeli *tunc implenda, dicente angelo* Ecce concipies." So also Plummer (p. 24): "The words are

ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω; καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ 35
Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου

the avowal of a maiden conscious of her own purity; and they are drawn from her by the strange declaration that she is to have a son before she is married." So also Reitzenstein, Gunkel. It was also probably the view of the evangelist that the conception *did* follow upon the Annunciation and Mary's response thereto. That, however, does not meet the point that the words of *vv.* 30, 31 do not themselves raise the idea of conception *before marriage*, or of themselves imply *immediate* conception.

(2) The usual interpretation of Roman Catholic exegetes, whom Lagrange follows, is to assign to the words ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω an absolute meaning, including the future as well as the past and present. Mary then expresses by the words the fact that she has formed an intention of remaining a virgin. Thus Mary's question to the angel is naturally occasioned by the intention which she has formed, and which she therewith declares. No doubt it is true that, as Lagrange urges, a present tense can on occasion be used for a future as well as for a past, but it is not legitimate to extract the idea of an antecedent vow of perpetual virginity from these simple words. Moreover, we are then confronted with the question as to why Mary had become betrothed to Joseph. Lagrange answers: "We do not know, and to frame hypotheses would be unprofitable enough. The simplest solution is to suppose that marriage with such a man as Joseph protected her from proposals incessantly renewed, and assured to her repose" (p. 33). How far indeed have we travelled from the atmosphere of the narrative of the Annunciation!

(3) The true answer is that a narrative of this kind ought not to be subjected to the strain of such questions. The real purpose of Mary's question to the angel is to give the writer an opening for the angel's prophecy as to how the conception is to come to pass.

35. The child is to be conceived in the maiden under the direct operation of God's Spirit. Therefore the child will be indeed 'Son of God,' not only in virtue of the kingly inheritance, which will entitle him to that designation (*v.* 32), but also because, in his very origin, he is sprung from God.

The history of the exegesis of this verse (cf. Bardenhewer, 'Mariae Verkündigung,' *Biblische Studien*, x. 5, p. 132) is most illuminating for the history of doctrine. Justin (*Apol.* i. 33, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 105) interprets πνεῦμα ἅγιον and δύναμις Ὑψίστου of the Logos, who is thus understood to incarnate himself, so to speak, in the Virgin's womb. This remains the dominant view until the fourth century, when, as the doctrine of the Holy Spirit becomes more clearly defined, there is a tendency to interpret the δύναμις of the Eternal Son and the πνεῦμα ἅγιον of the Third Person in the Trinity. This remains the prevailing exegesis in the Middle Age and is maintained by John of Damascus and St. Thomas Aquinas. These later developments of doctrine must not be read into the Gospel text. The idea of the pre-existent Son plays no part in this passage or elsewhere in the synoptic Gospels. The Spirit of God means here, as in the Old Testament, God's active

ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅΓΙΟΝ ΚΛΗΘΉϹΕΤΑΙ, υἱὸς
36 θεοῦ· καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἐλεισάβετ ἡ συγγενίς σου καὶ αὐτὴ συν-

35 το γεννωμενον] add εκ σου C*Θ 1-22-131 33 124 a c e m syr.vg Justin (?) Diat Valentt (ap Hipp) *Dial* Ephr (gk) Ath Diod Iren (lat) Tert ⅓ (*al loc* in te) om ℵABDL al b vg syr.hl aegg arm Petr.Al Eus codd ap Ephr (gk) Cyr Tert ⅓ Cypr

power. The evangelist is concerned with the origin of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and he teaches that he came by the operation of God's Spirit upon the Virgin Mary. πνεῦμα ἅγιον and δύναμις Ὑψίστου are not to be distinguished. The two clauses, as Maldonatus recognised, are two parallel statements of the same thing in accordance with the idiom of Hebrew poetry. The 'overshadowing' of the Holy Spirit is the counterpart to ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω above. ἐπισκιάζειν is to be understood of a local overshadowing of the divine power. In Ex. xl. 29 it is used of the overshadowing of the cloud of the divine Presence. So also again in the narrative of the Transfiguration (Lk. ix. 34 with note *ad loc.* and parallels). Norden, however (*Die Geburt des Kindes*, p. 92), following Leisegang, *Pneuma Hagion*, looks to Philonic texts and Philonic doctrine to illustrate the usage of the word in this verse. The darkening of the reason (σκότος τοῦ λογισμοῦ), Philo teaches, brings about an ecstasy of the soul. But in the actual passage which Norden adduces, the use of ἐπισκιάζειν (a not uncommon word in Philo) is quite different from that in the Gospel text. In *Quod Deus Immut.* i. p. 273 M., commenting on Gen. vi. 4 (*the intercourse of the angels with the daughters of men*), Philo says that so long as there shine in the soul the pure rays of wisdom by which the wise man sees God and his powers the false angels are impotent, but when the light of the understanding, being dulled, is darkened (ὅταν δὲ ἀμυδρωθὲν ἐπισκιασθῇ τὸ διανοίας φῶς), then the companions of darkness are able to hold intercourse with the passions (spoken of in Scripture as 'the daughters of men') and beget themselves offspring. Apart from the fact that this passage is concerned with evil spirits, the verb ἐπισκιάζειν itself is there used in the passive to describe a quasi-negative condition of the διάνοια. It is not used of the spirits whose activity is described in quite other terms. In Luke, on the other hand, the verb describes what may be spoken of as the active 'overshadowing' of the divine Spirit.

διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον . . . υἱὸς θεοῦ] The construction of this sentence is obscure. To take ἅγιον as attribute to τὸ γεννώμενον is scarcely possible. With the punctuation of W.H. υἱὸς θεοῦ must be taken as an extension of the predicate: "wherefore the child shall be called holy, Son of God." This is perhaps best, in spite of the difficulty that υἱὸς θεοῦ is not an extension of the idea expressed by ἅγιον. The alternative is to punctuate after ἅγιον and supply ἔσται: "wherefore also the child shall be holy, he shall be called Son of God." τὸ γεννώμενον, 'that which shall be begotten,' referring back to the previous sentence; cf. Mt. i. 20 τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν.

36. The angel authenticates his message by telling Mary that a similar though less stupendous event has already befallen her kinswoman Elizabeth. ἡ συγγενίς σου] This is the only passage in the Gospels which tells of a relationship between the families of Jesus and the Baptist.

*εἴληφεν υἱὸν ἐν γήρει αὐτῆς, καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστὶν*
*αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ στείρᾳ· ὅτι* οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ 37
πᾶν ῥῆμα. *εἶπεν δὲ* Μαριάμ *Ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη* Κυρίου· *γένοιτό* 38
*μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὁ ἄγγελος.*

38 *ειπεν δε . . . ρημα σου* om b e

37. A slight modification of God's words to Abraham, Gen. xviii. 14 *μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα; οὐ . . . πᾶν*] A Semitism for 'nothing.' *ῥῆμα* here as in Gen. represents דָּבָר 'thing about which one speaks,' 'an affair,' 'a thing.'

38. Mary humbly accepts the lot which has been appointed for her. The actual fulfilment of the prophecy of *v.* 35 must be supposed to follow after the departure of the angel. But in this case we have no counterpart in narrative to *v.* 24.

### The Meeting of Mary and Elizabeth (i. 39-56)

The future mother of the Christ child visits her kinswoman who is to be the mother of the Christ's forerunner. The future relations of John and Jesus are foreshadowed in the older woman's greeting to Mary, and Elizabeth's unborn babe shews himself conscious of the presence of the mother of his Lord.

The scene links together the two stories of Annunciation which have preceded, and prepares the way for the two birth narratives which are to follow.

*Ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις* 39
*ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὴν ὀρινὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα,*
*καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ζαχαρίου καὶ ἠσπάσατο τὴν* 40
Ἐλεισάβετ. *καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς* 41
Μαρίας *ἡ* Ἐλεισάβετ, *ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ*

39. Mary goes to her kinswoman Elizabeth to satisfy herself of the truth of the angel's words (*v.* 36). *μετὰ σπουδῆς*] With the zeal and haste which a sign divinely vouchsafed called for. *εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα*] 'to a city of Judah.' Cf. 2 Regn. ii. 1 *εἰς μίαν τῶν πόλεων Ἰούδα*. It is useless to try to guess the name of the city and unnecessary to suppose that a name has fallen out.

41. *ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος*] Cf. Gen. xxv. 22 *ἐσκίρτων δὲ τὰ παιδία ἐν αὐτῇ*. Here, as in Gen. xxv. (of Rebecca's children), the idea is that the movement of the unborn babe foreshadows the future lot of the child. S.B. ii. p. 101 quote a similar *motif* from Sota 5. 20 c. 14, where Rabban Gamaliel (*c.* A.D. 90) deduces from the Hebrew text of Ps. lxviii. 27 that the unborn embryos sang a song of praise at the crossing of the Red Sea. The movement of the prophetic child is perhaps thought of as the occasion of Elizabeth's inspiration. The welcome to Mary on the part of the unborn babe reveals to Elizabeth that Mary is to be the mother of her Lord. Cf. *v.* 44.

42 *αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου ἡ* Ἐλεισάβετ, *καὶ*
*ἀνεφώνησεν κραυγῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ εἶπεν* Εὐλογημένη *σὺ ἐν*
43 *γυναιξίν, καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου. καὶ*
*πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου πρὸς ἐμέ;*
44 *ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ σου εἰς τὰ ὦτά*
*μου, ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου.*
45 *καὶ μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσασα ὅτι ἔσται τελείωσις τοῖς λελαλη-*
46 *μένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ* Κυρίου. Καὶ *εἶπεν* Μαριάμ

46 Μαριαμ] Ελεισαβετ a b l* Iren (lat) ½ codd ap Orig (lat) Hom in Luc Nicet.

42. *εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπός κτλ.*] We may probably infer from this that Luke thinks of the conception as having already taken place.

43. Elizabeth feels herself to be unworthy to receive a visit from the mother of the Messiah. Cf. 2 Regn. xxiv. 21 (Ornan to David) *τί ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ κύριός μου ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ;*

44. *ἰδοὺ γάρ*] Elizabeth explains how it is that she is able to recognise in Mary 'the mother of her Lord.' The babe had recognised her, and Elizabeth knew the truth from the babe's movement of joy.

45. It is not easy to decide whether *ὅτι* should be taken to mean 'that,' in which case the following clause explains the content of what Mary believed, or whether it means 'because,' in which case the following clause gives the ground for Mary's blessedness. The latter is perhaps to be preferred.

46. *καὶ εἶπεν Μαριάμ*] The reading Ἐλεισάβετ for Μαριάμ attested by Old Latin texts, Irenaeus iv. 12 Harvey (so best MSS.) (contrast Iren. iii. 11), Niceta of Remesiana, and MSS. referred to by Jerome (or Origen) in the Latin trans. of Origen's 7th Homily on Luke, is hard to account for as a correction or corruption of an original Μαριάμ, and in spite of the support of all Greek MSS. and almost all versions, the conclusion should probably be drawn that Μαριάμ is not original. Harnack (followed by Blass, Loisy, and others) holds (*Sitz.-Ber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1900, pp. 538 f.) that the original reading was simply *καὶ εἶπεν*, that the names Μαριάμ and Ἐλεισάβετ were variously added to make the subject explicit, and that the true interpretation of the original text is to supply Ἐλεισάβετ. Elizabeth's position does, and Mary's does not, resemble the position of the long childless Hannah in 1 Regn. i., ii., whose song the Magnificat so closely follows. Moreover, Elizabeth's situation in conceiving in her old age supplies a fuller meaning for the *ταπείνωσις* of *v.* 48 than the word receives if Mary be the speaker. Also the parallel with the Benedictus becomes closer. The two canticles are then assigned to the two aged parents of the Baptist, both of whom are related "to have been filled with the Holy Ghost" (*vv.* 41, 67). Lastly, the wording of *v.* 56 supports the view that Ἐλεισάβετ is the true subject of *εἶπεν* in *v.* 46. If the subject of *ἔμεινεν* was the same as the subject of *εἶπεν*, we should not expect the name Μαριάμ to be repeated, while Elizabeth is referred to by a pronoun (*σὺν αὐτῇ*). If, however, there has been a change

Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον,
καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου· 47
ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ, 48
ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί·
ὅτι ἐποίησέν μοι μεγάλα ὁ δυνατός, 49
καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεάς 50
τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν.
Ἐποίησεν κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ, 51
διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν·
καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων καὶ ὕψωσεν ταπεινούς, 52
πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐξαπέστειλεν 53
κενούς.

of subject at *v.* 56, both *Μαριάμ* and the pronoun *αὐτῇ* are what we should expect. These arguments are weighty, and they are not counterbalanced by the arguments that the reference to the inspiration of Elizabeth in *v.* 41 is sufficiently explained by the exclamation in *v.* 42, and that the words of 48 b, though natural when placed in the mouth of Mary, are an over-statement when ascribed to Elizabeth, cf. *v.* 48 n. We may notice that if the original text omitted the subject, we have an exact parallel to Hannah's song in 1 Regn. ii. 1, which is prefaced by the words *καὶ εἶπεν*.

46 f. The first half of the canticle expresses the personal thankfulness of the speaker. In the second half we pass over from the thought of God as *σωτήρ* of the individual to God as saviour of Israel from her haughty oppressors. In this general character, as well as in detail, it closely resembles the song of Hannah. Elizabeth takes her place as an inspired prophetess with the holy women of old—Miriam, Deborah, Hannah.

*ἡ ψυχή μου . . . τὸ πνεῦμά μου*] The two words are here interchangeable in meaning.

48. *ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν . . . τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ*] If these words are placed in the mouth of Elizabeth, the *ταπείνωσις* refers to her childlessness (cf. *ὄνειδος* *v.* 25) and is a direct echo of 1 Regn. i. 11 (of Hannah), *ἐὰν ἐπιβλέπων ἐπιβλέψῃς τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης σου*. So also Gen. xvi. 11 (of Hagar), xxix. 32 (of Lea). The word can also be used with a more general connotation, e.g. 1 Regn. ix. 16; 2 Regn. xvi. 12; 4 Regn. xiv. 26; Ps. ix. 14, xxiv. 18; but it regularly suggests positive humiliation and distress. This is very appropriate to Elizabeth, but not to Mary.

*ἰδοὺ γὰρ . . . γενεαί*] Closely parallel to the words of Lea in Gen. xxx. 13 (see Additional Note) and in no way out of place in the mouth of Elizabeth.

51-55. God's redemption of Israel, regarded as already achieved, is described in language which is taken almost entirely from O.T. sources. See Additional Note, pp. 303 f.

53. *ἐξαπέστειλεν κενούς*] The two

54 ἀντελάβετο Ἰϲραὴλ παιδὸϲ αὐτοῦ,
μνηϲθῆναι ἐλέουϲ,
55 καθὼϲ ἐλάλησεν πρὸϲ τοὺϲ πατέραϲ ημῶν,
τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ ϲπέρματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

56 Ἔμεινεν δὲ Μαριὰμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡς μῆνας τρεῖς, καὶ ὑπ-
έστρεψεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.
57 Τῇ δὲ Ἐλεισάβετ ἐπλήσθη ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν,
58 καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱόν. καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ περίοικοι καὶ οἱ συγ-
γενεῖς αὐτῆς ὅτι ἐμεγάλυνεν Κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ᾽
59 αὐτῆς, καὶ συνέχαιρον αὐτῇ. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ
ὀγδόῃ ἦλθαν περιτεμεῖν τὸ παιδίον, καὶ ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ
60 τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ζαχαρίαν· καὶ ἀποκριθεῖσα

56 *συν αυτῃ*] by Elizabeth syrr.

words recur in juxtaposition in Lk. xx. 10 and 11.

55. τῷ Ἀβραὰμ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] To be taken as virtually in apposition to πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν in the preceding verse, in spite of the change of case. This accords better with the simple syntactical structure of the canticle than to regard καθὼς . . . πατέρας ἡμῶν as parenthesis, and to construct τῷ Ἀβραάμ as *dativus commodi* with μνησθῆναι ἐλέους.

56. Mary returns to her home before the birth of Elizabeth's child. There is nothing to shew whether Luke thinks of Mary's home as the home of her parents or the home of Joseph. At the time of the birth of her child Mary is living with Joseph, but the evangelist passes over the circumstances of their coming together.

57-66. *The Birth of John the Baptist.*

57. Cf. Gen. xxv. 24 καὶ ἐπληρώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν.

58. Elizabeth had remained in retirement (*v.* 24), and her neighbours and kinsfolk (other than Mary, who had been told by the angel) remained in ignorance of her condition until the birth of the child.

59. In the O.T. the name is regularly bestowed at birth. There appears to be no other evidence of a Jewish custom of giving the name at circumcision, at any rate until a very much later date (eighth cent. A.D.). See Klostermann and S.B. *ad loc.* Gressmann and J. Weiss suspect that Luke has been influenced by the Greek custom according to which infants were named on the seventh or tenth day after birth. Examples of naming after the father are given by S.B. (ii. p. 107) from the Talmud, and cf. also Jos. *Ant.* xx. 9. 1; *B.J.* v. 13. 2. A more frequent custom was to name after the grandfather.

60. We must suppose that the name was communicated to Elizabeth by divine inspiration, and that Zacharias then confirms what is said on the authority of the angelic annunciation. The story loses all

ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ κληθήσεται Ἰωάνης.
καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὅτι Οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς συγ- 61
γενείας σου ὃς καλεῖται τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ. ἐνένευον δὲ 62
τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτό. καὶ αἰτή- 63
σας πινακίδιον ἔγραψεν λέγων Ἰωάνης ἐστὶν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. ἀνεῴχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παρα- 64
χρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλει εὐλογῶν τὸν θεόν.
Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος τοὺς περιοικοῦντας αὐ- 65
τούς, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ὀρινῇ τῆς Ἰουδαίας διελαλεῖτο πάντα
τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, καὶ ἔθεντο πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐν τῇ 66
καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν, λέγοντες Τί ἄρα τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἔσται; καὶ
γὰρ χεὶρ Κυρίου ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ 67
αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων

Εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, 68
ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ,

point if we imagine that Elizabeth and Zacharias had arranged the matter previously.

62. *ἐνένευον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ*] Zacharias, therefore, must be thought of as deaf as well as dumb: "a false trait which would readily occur in a popular story" (J. Weiss). Note the Lucan optat. (with *ἄν*) in indirect question. Cf. Ac. x. 17, Lk. ix. 46, xv. 26, xviii. 36 (D). Cf. Blass, § 66. 3, and for the article before indirect question (rare in N.T. except Lk.), Blass, § 47. 5, and Introd. p. lxxxii. *ἐννεύω* here only in N.T. Found in Aristoph. and Lucian.

63. *καὶ αἰτήσας*] *ὁμοίως διὰ νεύματος* Euthymius.

*λέγων*] Not 'and said,' which of course would anticipate the miracle of the next verse, but, like the Heb. לֵאמֹר, 'he wrote to say.' Cf. 4 Regn. x. 6 *καὶ ἔγραψεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς βιβλίον δεύτερον λέγων*.

*Ἰωάνης ἐστὶν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*] *ἐστίν*, not *ἔσται*. The present is emphatic. The name is already fixed.

*καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες*] i.e. at the miraculous agreement between what Elizabeth had said and what the deaf mute Zacharias had written.

64. The period set by the angel for the dumbness of Zacharias (*v.* 20) is now fulfilled.

*καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ*] A zeugma with *στόμα ἀνεῴχθη*. Western texts (D lat.vt syr.sin) supply *ἐλύθη*.

65. *διελαλεῖτο*] In Greek Bible only here and vi. 11. Freq. in Jos. and Polyb.

*τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα*] 'these events.' Heb. דְּבָרִים.

66. *ἔθεντο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*] Hebraism. Cf. 1 Regn. xxi. 12 *καὶ ἔθετο Δαυεὶδ τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ*.

*χεὶρ Κυρίου*] An O.T. phrase peculiar to Lk. in the N.T. Cf. Ac. xi. 21, xiii. 11.

67. The Benedictus, like the Magnificat, is very loosely appended to the narrative.

68-69. A blessing to God for the redemption which he has brought to his people by raising up a leader in

69 *καὶ* ἤγειρεν κέρας *σωτηρίας ἡμῖν*
*ἐν οἴκῳ* Δαυεὶδ *παιδὸς αὐτοῦ,*

70 *καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,*
71 σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς *πάντων* τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς,
72 *ποιῆσαι* ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν
*καὶ* μνησθῆναι διαθήκης *ἁγίας* αὐτοῦ,

73 ὅρκον *ὃν* ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ *τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν,*
74 *τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας*
75 *λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ*
*ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν.*

76 Καὶ *σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης Ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ,*
*προπορεύσῃ γὰρ* ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ,
77 *τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ*
*ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν,*

the house of David. This is the ancient Messianic hope of national salvation associated with the Davidic dynasty, and it links up with the angel's annunciation to Mary, *v.* 32.

70. A direct reference to the prophetic promises of the O.T. It is to be noted that when the canticle, as here, ceases to be a direct echo of O.T. language, characteristic Lucan phraseology appears. Acts iii. 21 gives an almost exact equivalent for this verse: *ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν.* Cf. also Ac. iii. 18.

71. *σωτηρίαν*] In apposition, possibly to *κέρας σωτηρίας*, or better to the whole of the preceding *v.* 70. The salvation is what God promised through the prophets.

73. *ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν*] *ὅρκον* should be in apposition to *διαθήκης*, but it has been attracted into the case of the relative *ὃν* governed by *ὤμοσεν.* Cf. xx. 17.

73-75. The promise to Abraham is interpreted in a broad and spiritualised sense: not the gift of the promised land, but the gift of deliverance from foes for continual service of God. The language here again deserts O.T. precedent. The accumulation of infinitives, with a participle in agreement with the subject of the second infinitive, does not read like translation from a Semitic source. The evangelist's own hand may be suspected. For the construction *δοῦναι ἡμῖν . . . λατρεύειν* cf. Ac. iv. 29 *δὸς τοῖς δούλοις σου . . . λαλεῖν.*

76. "And thou, my child, shalt be called prophet of the Most High." To be compared with *v.* 32 (of Jesus) *υἱὸς Ὑψίστου κληθήσεται.*

77. *τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας*] The rôle of the Baptist is to make

διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 78
ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους,
ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις, 79
τοῦ κατευθῦναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης.

Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ηὔξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι, καὶ ἦν 80
ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις ἕως ἡμέρας ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

78 ἐπισκέψεται pap$^4$ ℵ*B(L)WΘ syrr (sin.vg) aegg arm go: ἐπεσκέψατο ACD al latt syr.hl aeth Iren(lat) ς

known to the people the salvation to come by preaching the remission of sins. The Baptist came κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας c. iii. Or perhaps, if the hymn is composed by a Christian with a Christian perspective, ἐν ἀφέσει should be connected closely with σωτηρίας: "knowledge of the salvation which consists in remission of sins." Cf. xxiv. 47.

78. διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ κτλ.] There is a direct echo of these words in *Test. XII. Patr.* Levi iv. ἕως ἐπισκέψηται κύριος πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σπλάγχνοις υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος.

ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέψεται] With the reading ἐπεσκέψατο we revert to the 'eschatological' form of prophecy of the first verses (cf. Addit. Note). The future ἐπισκέψεται is better attested and suits the context better.

ἀνατολή] 'the dawn' or 'the rising sun,' used as a metaphor for the Messianic redemption or for the Messiah. Cf. Mal. iv. 2 ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης. That this is the true meaning of the word here seems plainly indicated by the metaphors of light and darkness in the next verse. Nevertheless the interpretation of ἐξ ὕψους is not easy. The *rising* sun does not shine 'from on high'; we must interpret of the sun which rises and mounts on high, rather than of the dawn itself. S.B. favour the suggestion that the use of ἀνατολή here depends upon the LXX of Jer. xxiii. 5, Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, where the word stands for 'the sprout' of the tree of Jesse, i.e. the Davidic king. But ἐξ ὕψους becomes even harder on this interpretation, and the metaphors of light and darkness in *v.* 78 lose their appropriateness. J. Weiss thinks that the author of the Psalm took over the Messianic term ἀνατολή (intended originally in the sense of Jer. xxiii.) without understanding it, and himself interpreted it of the rising light of sun or star. He may then himself have introduced the words ἐξ ὕψους. A further suggestion by J. Weiss is ingenious, but perhaps hardly probable: he thinks that ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους 'the [Davidic] sprout from on high' may have been a recognised term for the heavenly Messiah (conceived after the manner of the figure in Dan. vii.) in contrast with the conception of an earthly Messianic king.

80. The narrative concerning the birth of John the Baptist closes with a summary notice of his growth and life similar to that in Ju. xiii. 24 (of Samson) and 1 Regn. ii. 26 (of Samuel). See also below, ii. 40, 52, of Jesus.

### THE BIRTH OF JESUS (ii. 1-20)

A beautiful pastoral narrative. Joseph, accompanied by Mary, journeys to Bethlehem, the city of David, on the occasion of an imperial enrolment. While they are there Mary's son is born, and as there is no room in the inn he is laid in a manger. Meantime the birth of the infant Saviour in David's city is proclaimed to shepherds by an angel, who directs them to the manger-cradle in Bethlehem. The heavenly host is heard declaring praise to God and peace among men. The shepherds find Mary, Joseph, and the babe, and make known what had been declared to them.

Formidable difficulties are encountered if it is supposed that we have here a record of actual happenings vouched for by those who took part in them. For a full discussion of the problems raised by the supposed census of the nativity see Schürer, *G.J.V.* i.$^4$ pp. 508 f. The following are the chief points:

(1) Nothing is known of a general census under Augustus. Luke has probably wrongly generalised from a local provincial census. Cf. the somewhat similar misstatement concerning the famine, Acts xi. 28.

(2) Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. 13. 5; xviii. 1. 1) tells of a census conducted by Quirinius, governor of Syria, with Coponius, procurator of Judaea. Josephus speaks of this as an innovation which was widely resented and led to the rising of the Zealots under Judas of Galilee. This is the ἀπογραφή referred to in Acts v. 37, and it is probably the same ἀπογραφή which is here in mind. It occurred after the deposition of Archelaus, when, for the first time, Palestine came under direct Roman government, A.D. 6 or 7, i.e. some ten years later than 'the days of Herod the king' (Lk. i. 5; Mt. ii. 1).

(3) A Roman census under Herod, who was an allied king, was impossible.

(4) A Roman census was based on residence, and did not require a man to report to his ancestral city. It has been suggested that such a method may have been adopted as a concession to Jewish prejudice. But it is very doubtful if it would have been practicable.

These considerations point to the conclusion that Luke has transposed the well-known census of Quirinius to a date some ten or eleven years before it actually took place, overlooking the circumstance that a Roman census of Palestine under the auspices of the imperial *legatus* of Syria would not be possible while Herod was king (so Schürer, Holtzmann, J. Weiss, Ed. Meyer, Loisy). Luke's history is not always dependable. There can be little doubt that in his account of Gamaliel's speech in Acts v. he has wrongly dated the rising of Theudas, which in point of fact did not take place until after the time at which Gamaliel is supposed to speak.[1] It is not unreasonable to suspect a similar error here.

Inaccuracy of some kind is widely acknowledged, but various attempts have been made to fit in the account of Lk. ii. with the other evidence. Thus it has been proposed to translate πρώτη 'before,' and make it govern ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. This translation would make Luke himself distinguish the census of the nativity from the census of Quirinius. But the translation does violence to the language and yields a very poor sense. Cf. note *ad loc.*

Ramsay[2] argues that the Lucan account is accurate throughout. There is evidence which indicates that Quirinius twice held office in Syria, and, on the evidence of a recently discovered inscription which refers to a prefect of Quirinius (*op. cit.* p. 285), Ramsay comes to the conclusion that Quirinius held office as *legatus* in Syria for the first time from 11/10–8/7 B.C. Now Tertullian dates the census of the nativity, not under Quirinius, but under Sentius Saturninus (*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 19). Saturninus, we know from Josephus, held office as *legatus* of Syria from 9-6 B.C. Ramsay accepts Tertullian's statement, and thinks it probable that Quirinius and Saturninus were for some time in office together with different spheres of action (*op. cit.* p. 293). He therefore proposes to throw back the date of the nativity to about the year 8 B.C., and, on the authority of Luke, supported by the statement of Tertullian, postulates a universal census of the empire for that time (*op. cit.* p. 243).

The objection remains that if such a census was held in Palestine in the days of Herod, it is remarkable that Josephus makes no mention of it, especially as we should expect that it would have called forth the same popular indignation which we know was aroused by the census of Quirinius in A.D. 6/7. Moreover we must assume that Josephus was in error when he speaks of the later census as though it were an innovation.

A further objection to postulating a universal census at about the year 8 B.C. has recently come to light through the discovery of inscriptions, dated 7/6 B.C., at Cyrene in Africa, which contain imperial rescripts dealing with the composition of juries in the province of Cyrene. It is clear from these inscriptions that whereas the imperial government was in possession of lists of Roman citizens in Cyrene, they did not possess statistics with regard to the Greek inhabitants of the city. These inscriptions therefore provide a formidable *argumentum e silentio* against the supposition that a general enrolment of the Empire had been undertaken at the date which Ramsay proposes.[1]

---

[1] According to Jos. *Ant.* xx. 5. 1, the rising of Theudas took place under the procuratorship of Fadus, i.e. about A.D. 45.

[2] *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, pp. 238 f.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Luke has made a historical mistake. None the less we may recognise a true idea in the narrative as it stands—an idea to which the evangelist was not indifferent. The birth of Christ roughly coincided with the establishment of an ordered government and administration throughout the world. The Roman Empire provided the conditions, which enabled the new faith to establish itself as a world-wide Church. If there is chronological error, there is also dramatic appropriateness in associating the birth of the Christ with an imperial decree for the enrolment of 'all the world.'

The internal evidence of the Gospels raises difficulties of another kind. If in actual fact Mary had been prepared beforehand for the future of her son, it seems strange that she and his brethren should be represented in the earliest Gospel (Mk. iii. 21, 31) as attempting to restrain him from his public work in the belief that 'he was beside himself.'

If we may not look for the origin of the story in actual reminiscence, it is natural to enquire into possible antecedents in popular belief, folk-lore, or literature which may have contributed to the story as we have it. An ingenious but highly speculative theory as to the origin of the story was propounded by Gressmann (*Das Weihnachtsevangelium*, 1914). Gressmann finds incoherences in the Gospel narrative as it stands. Following Eichorn he thinks that the child's manger-cradle ought to stand in direct relation with the shepherds, whereas in point of fact the connexion is not established in the story. It is the parents, not the shepherds, who lay the child in the manger. The shepherds only find him there in accordance with the angel's words. Moreover the shepherds themselves, he argues, are really superfluous to the story as it stands. He is disposed, therefore, to conjecture an earlier form of the story in which shepherds discover a foundling child in their own manger and are told by an angelic voice that this child is the promised Messiah. This pre-Christian story may be supposed to have come into Judaism from Egypt. Plutarch (*De Is. et Osir.* 12, p. 355 e) relates two versions of the story of the birth of Osiris. One is that when Osiris was born a divine voice was heard proclaiming "The Lord of all comes forth to light." But according to another version, a certain Pamyles in Egyptian Thebes was drawing water from the Temple of Zeus, and, while there, he heard a voice which bade him cry aloud that "the great king, the benefactor, Osiris is born"; thereupon Cronos entrusted the child to his care, and he reared it. Gressmann interprets Plutarch's account to mean that Pamyles discovered the infant Osiris in the Temple as a foundling. This legend, he thinks, passed over into Judaism, where it became a legend of the finding of the child Messiah, and in this form was subsequently attached to Jesus. But Jesus being a child of real human parents, the legend became disjointed. Mary and Joseph displace the shepherds at the manger, while the shepherds still receive the angelic message, though they become in truth otiose figures in the story.

---

[1] Cf. A. von Premerstein in *Zeitschr. d. Savigny Stiftung, Romanist. Abteil.* xlviii. (1928), pp. 448 f.

Gressmann's theory has been vigorously criticised by Clemen.[1] (1) It is by no means clear from Plutarch or elsewhere that Osiris was ever regarded as a foundling child. (2) Nothing is known of a pre-Christian Jewish legend of the Messiah as a foundling child, such as Gressmann postulates. (3) Nor again is it clear that the Lucan story as it stands is so incoherent as Gressmann thinks. The shepherds are by no means superfluous to the narrative: their finding of the child in the manger leads on naturally and directly to the statement that they made known the good news which had been told to them. Thus the shepherds are the vouchers for the story. The theme of the heavenly voice at the birth common to Luke and to Plutarch's legend is too natural to call for a theory of direct dependence.

Shepherds are found associated in legend with the birth and childhood of Cyrus, of Romulus and Remus, and also of Mithras.[2] Geffcken[3] argues for a derivation of the *motif* of the shepherds ultimately from Mithraism by way of Posidonius, but his argument appears to be inconclusive.[4] It is best to look for sources near at hand. It is clear that a dominant theme in the narrative is the birth of Jesus Christ in Bethlehem, the city of David. David himself was a shepherd, and a pastoral scene is fully in harmony with the Old Testament associations of Bethlehem. We may perhaps go further. At Bethlehem there was 'a tower of flocks' (Gen. xxxv. 21), and in Micah iv. 8 the 'tower of the flocks' is associated with 'the kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem.' The text from Micah appears to have been brought into connexion with the 'tower of the flocks' in Genesis, for the Palestinian

---

[1] *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1916, pp. 237 f.; *Religionsgesch. Erklärung d. N.T.* pp. 203 f.

[2] Cf. Cumont, *Textes et monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, i. p. 162.

[3] 'Die Hirten auf dem Felde,' *Hermes*, 1914, pp. 321-351.

[4] Cf. Clemen, *op. cit.* pp. 203 f.

Targum on Gen. xxxv. 21 writes[1]: "And Jacob proceeded and spread his tent beyond the tower of Eder (i.e. of flocks), the place from whence it is to be that the king Meshiha will be revealed at the end of the days." If this association of Gen. xxxv. 21 with Messianic expectation goes back to the first century, it would encourage the theme of 'shepherds watching over the flocks' on the night of the nativity of David's heir in David's town.

---

[1] *Targums on the Pentateuch*, E.T. by J. W. Etheridge, 1862, p. 281.

II. 1 *Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐξῆλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην·*
2 *(αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας*

2 αυτη]+η ℵᶜACL al Eus ϛ πρωτη εγενετο] εγενετο πρωτη ℵ*D (?) Justin Orig(lat)

1. *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*] After mention of the growth of the youthful John Baptist, the narrative now turns back to the period of the preceding story. The birth of Jesus must be placed six months after the birth of John. Cf. i. 26.

*δόγμα*] A decree. Good Greek usage. Used again of imperial decrees, Ac. xvii. 7, and of the decrees of the Council at Jerusalem, Ac. xvi. 4.

*Αὐγούστου*] The transliteration is less usual in Greek than the translation *Σέβαστος*.

*ἀπογράφεσθαι*] 'to be enrolled.' Passive. The provincial enrolments of imperial times were undertaken for purposes of taxation. Cf. Schürer, *G.J.V.* i. pp. 510 f., and literature there referred to. For the taxation itself the proper verb is *ἀποτιμᾶν*.

*πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην*] A natural and usual exaggeration to mean the Roman Empire.

*αὕτη ἀπογραφή, κτλ.*] The best MSS. do not give the article between *αὕτη* and *ἀπογραφή*. *αὕτη* is therefore best taken as subject and *ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη* as predicate, *αὕτη* being attracted into agreement with the predicate. Cf. Blass, § 49. 4. The sentence is somewhat awkwardly expressed as there are virtually two predicates: *πρώτη ἀπογραφή* and *ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Σ. Κ.*: "This was the first enrolment, that, namely, which was made when Q. was Governor of Syria." *πρώτη* is intended to contrast this new proceeding of the Roman Emperor with the previous condition of things when no such enrolment had been attempted. This gives a full and satisfactory meaning, and it harmonises with the reference to *ἡ ἀπογραφή*, 'the well-known enrolment,' in Ac. v. To suppose that *πρώτη* contrasts this enrolment with another that took place later is to introduce an idea which is irrelevant to the context. Reference may be made to Plummer (p. 50) for a full account and refutation of the various expedients which have been proposed to evade the plain meaning of the text. Lagrange revives the theory of Ewald and Caspari that *πρώτη* should be given a comparative force and made to govern the clause *ἡγεμονεύοντος κτλ.*: "This enrolment took place before Quirinius was Governor of Syria." But though *πρῶτος* may govern a genitive with a comparative force as in Jo. i. 15, 30, the addition of *ἡγεμονεύοντος* is,

Κυρηνίου·) καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἕκαστος 3
εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν. Ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ τῆς 4
Γαλιλαίας ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρὲτ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν εἰς πόλιν
Δαυεὶδ ἥτις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ
οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαυείδ, ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριὰμ τῇ 5
ἐμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ, οὔσῃ ἐγκύῳ. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ εἶναι 6
αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, καὶ
ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν 7

5 *τη εμνηστευμενη αυτω* ℵBCDL: uxore sua a b c ff$^2$ his wife syr.sin; add *γυναικι* A al pler l q vg ς'

as Plummer argues, fatal. Moreover, we should be left with a most pointless sentence.

P. Sulpicius Quirinius became Governor of Syria in A.D. 6. The Governors of Syria in the later years of King Herod were: 9–6 B.C. Sentius Saturninus; 6–4 B.C. Quinctilius Varus.

3. *πάντες*] This need not be interpreted to mean 'all the inhabitants of the Empire.' The intervening reference to Syria makes it easy to restrict the scope of this sentence to the inhabitants of Syria. The Roman census was based on residence. The method is well illustrated by Pap. Lond. 904, 20 f. (vol. iii. p. 124) which gives an edict (dated A.D. 104) of C. Vibius Maximus, Prefect of Egypt, requiring absentees to return to their own homes in view of the coming census: *τῆς κατ' οἰ[κίαν ἀπογραφῆς ἐν]εστώ[σης] ἀναγκαῖον [τοὺς ἀποδημήσαντα]ς καθ' ἥ[ντινα] δήποτε αἰτ[ίαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑαυτῶν] νομῶν προσα[ναγκά]σαι ἐπα[νελ]θεῖν εἰς τὰ ἑαυ[τῶν ἐ]φέστια ἵν[α] καὶ τὴν συνήθη [οἰ]κονομίαν τῆ[ς ἀπο]γραφῆς πληρώσωσιν καὶ τῇ προσ[ηκού]σῃ αὐτοῖς γεωργίᾳ προσκαρτερήσω[σιν]*. This procedure harmonises well with the statement in *v.* 3, but in *v.* 4 Luke regards Joseph as a native of Nazareth who goes up to Bethlehem for the enrolment, *because he was of Davidic lineage*. Zahn suggests that Joseph may have held property in Bethlehem. There is no hint of this in Luke. The motive of the narrative is to bring Joseph of the house of David to the city of David for the birth of the Messiah.

5. *τῇ ἐμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ*] We should probably read *τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ* with lat.vt (codd.) and syr.sin, the reading of ℵBD etc. being an early modification under the influence of i. 26, and the reading of the majority of the MSS. a conflation of the two readings. Joseph and Mary are represented by Luke as living together. It would be strange if Mary were to travel with Joseph when she was only betrothed to him.

*οὔσῃ ἐγκύῳ*] 'and she was great with child.' This addition to the sentence can hardly be thought of as giving a reason for Mary's accompanying Joseph, but it prepares the way for the subsequent birth at Bethlehem.

6. For the wording cf. Gen. xxv. 24, and above, i. 57.

*τὸν πρωτότοκον*] The word may be regarded as preparing for *v.* 23 *infra*, and as unemphatic. But had Luke wished to exclude the idea that Mary had other children after her 'first-born,' he would almost

*αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν φάτνῃ, διότι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς*
8 *τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι.* Καὶ *ποιμένες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ*
*χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ ἀγραυλοῦντες καὶ φυλάσσοντες φυλακὰς*
*τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν ποίμνην αὐτῶν. καὶ ἄγγελος* Κυρίου
9 *ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς καὶ δόξα* Κυρίου *περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς, καὶ*

certainly have chosen another word, e.g. *μονογενής* which he uses below, *c.* vii., of the son of the widow of Nain. In point of fact Luke, like the other evangelists, regarded Mary as the mother of a family, viii. 19, and therefore *πρωτότοκος* was a natural word to use of 'the first-born.'

*Protev. Jac.* xvii. (followed by *Ev. Pseudo-Matt.* xiii.) represents the birth as happening on the journey.

7. *ἐν φάτνῃ*] 'in a manger.' This is the usual meaning of the word, and it gives excellent sense. The manger or feeding-trough would probably be a movable receptacle placed on the ground. This Mary uses as a cradle for her infant. *φάτνη* may also be used to mean 'stall,' or the enclosure in which animals were penned (cf. Cadbury, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1926, p. 317), and it has been thought that this meaning makes a better contrast to *κατάλυμα*. But *ἐν φάτνῃ* goes closely with *ἀνέκλινεν*, and in this connexion the usual meaning of *φατνή* is the most appropriate.

*διότι οὐκ ἦν κτλ.*] The visitors were crowded out of the public shelter. *κατάλυμα* is probably inaccurately translated 'inn,' which is *πανδοχεῖον* in x. 34. In xxii. 11 *κατάλυμα* means 'the guest chamber,' and here too it probably denotes a single reception room in which the travellers would sleep.

The tradition that the birth of Jesus took place in a cave is found as early as Justin, *Dial.* 78 *ἐπειδὴ Ἰωσὴφ οὐκ εἶχεν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ ἐκείνῃ ποῦ καταλύσαι, ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμης κατέλυσε· καὶ τότε αὐτῶν ὄντων ἐκεῖ, ἐτετόκει ἡ Μαρία τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ αὐτὸν ἐτεθείκει*; and in *Protev. Jac.* xviii. f. Justin appeals to the text Is. xxxiii. 16 *οὗτος οἰκήσει ἐν ὑψηλῷ σπηλαίῳ πέτρας ἰσχυρᾶς.* The belief is hardly likely to have arisen out of this text. Probably some traditional *motif* of a divine birth in a cave (cf. Clemen, pp. 195 f.) has reappeared in a Christian dress. The cave at Bethlehem was already shewn in the time of Origen (*C. Cels.* i. 51). Constantine's basilica was erected behind the traditional spot. There is no trace of this tradition in the Lucan or in any Biblical text.

8. *καὶ ποιμένες ἦσαν*] The birth of the Christ is made known by an angel to shepherds. The idea that revelation is made to the simple is thoroughly in harmony with the spirit of the Gospels in general, and with St. Luke's Gospel in particular. But it was also a familiar notion in the ancient pagan world that the gods visited simple country people in preference to sophisticated town dwellers. Klostermann quotes Servius on Virg. *Ecl.* x. 26, "solent numina plerumque se rusticis offerre."

*ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ*] i.e. the country round Bethlehem. Here David had tended his father's sheep.

*τῆς νυκτός*] It is thus implied, though not definitely stated, that the birth of Jesus took place at night.

*ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ἄγγελος* 10
*Μὴ φοβεῖσθε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην*
*ἥτις ἔσται παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτὴρ* 11
*ὅς ἐστιν χριστὸς κύριος ἐν πόλει Δαυείδ· καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν* 12
*σημεῖον, εὑρήσετε βρέφος ἐσπαργανωμένον καὶ κείμενον ἐν*
*φάτνῃ. καὶ ἐξέφνης ἐγένετο σὺν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ πλῆθος στρα-* 13
*τιᾶς οὐρανίου αἰνούντων τὸν θεὸν καὶ λεγόντων*

> *Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀν-* 14
> *θρώποις εὐδοκίας.*

14 *ευδοκιας* ℵ*AB*DW latt aeg.sah go Iren(lat) Orig patres latt. omn. : *ευδοκια* L 33 al perm syrr aeg.boh *Dial* Orig$^3$ Eus Bas Greg.Naz Cyr.Hier Did Epiph Cyr ς

10. *μὴ φοβεῖσθε*] So also the angelic annunciations both to Zacharias and to Mary begin *μὴ φοβοῦ*.

*ἰδοὺ γὰρ εὐαγγελίζομαι . . . σωτήρ*] It is noteworthy that two of the words in the angelic annunciation of the birth of the Messiah (*εὐαγγελίζομαι, σωτήρ*) agree with the language concerning the birthday of Augustus in the commemorative inscription of Priene and other Asiatic towns (Dittenberger, *Or. Gr. Inscr. Sel.* no. 458, ii. p. 53): *Ἐπε[ιδὴ ἡ πάντα] διατάξασα τοῦ βίου ἡμῶν πρόνοια . . . τὸ τελειότατον τῷ βίῳ διεκόσμησεν ἐνενκαμένη τὸν Σεβαστόν . . . ὥσπερ ἡμεῖν καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡ[μᾶς σωτῆρα πέμψασα] τὸν παύσοντα μὲν πόλεμον, κοσμήσοντα δὲ πάντα . . . ἦρξεν δὲ τῷ κόσμῳ τῶν δι' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελι[ῶν ἡ γενέθλιος] τοῦ θεοῦ . . .*

*παντὶ τῷ λαῷ*] i.e. for all the people of Israel.

11. *σωτήρ*] Used of Jesus here only in the synoptic Gospels. Twice in Ac. (v. 31, xiii. 23). In indubitably Pauline Epp. only Phil. iii. 20. On the other hand it occurs frequently in the Pastoral Epp. and 2 Pet. Also in Jo. iv. 42 and 1 Jo. iv. 14. On the history of the title cf. Wendland, *Z.N.T.W.*, 1904, pp. 335 f.

*ὅς ἐστιν χριστὸς κύριος*] 'who is Christ [and] Lord.' This seems better than with B. Weiss to make *χριστός* an adjective, 'anointed Lord.' Possibly there has been an error at some stage in transcription or translation from the Aramaic, and the original words were *Χριστὸς Κυρίου* 'the Lord's Christ' as below, *v.* 26. This error occurred in LXX trans. of Lam. iv. 20, and possibly also in *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 36 (cf. xviii. 6).

12. *σημεῖον*] A token which shall at once serve to identify the child and to confirm the angel's words.

14. The reading of syr.sin, which inserts a *καί* before [*ἐν*] *ἀνθρώποις*, and reads *εὐδοκία*, would give a threefold division to the song of the heavenly host: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and goodwill to men." But there is but slender support for the *καί*, and the weight of MS. evidence upholds the genitive *εὐδοκίας*. We must therefore recognise two clauses connected by *καί*. The former proclaims God's glory in heaven, the second his gift of peace to his chosen upon earth. *ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας* seems to be virtually an equivalent for *πᾶς ὁ λαός* above (so J. Weiss), 'among

15 *Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἀπῆλθον ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ*
*ἄγγελοι, οἱ ποιμένες ἐλάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους Διέλθωμεν*
*δὴ ἕως Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἴδωμεν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο τὸ γεγονὸς ὃ ὁ*
16 *κύριος ἐγνώρισεν ἡμῖν. καὶ ἦλθαν σπεύσαντες καὶ ἀνεῦραν*
*τήν τε Μαριὰμ καὶ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ καὶ τὸ βρέφος κείμενον ἐν*
17 *τῇ φάτνῃ· ἰδόντες δὲ ἐγνώρισαν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ*
18 *λαληθέντος αὐτοῖς περὶ τοῦ παιδίου τούτου. καὶ πάντες*
*οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύμασαν περὶ τῶν λαληθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν*
19 *ποιμένων πρὸς αὐτούς, ἡ δὲ Μαρία πάντα συνετήρει τὰ*
20 *ῥήματα ταῦτα συνβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. καὶ*

the men of his choice,' or 'of his good pleasure.' A Christian reader would naturally interpret of the new Israel, the Christian Church. For this absolute use of *εὐδοκία* for the divine good pleasure cf. *Ps. Sol.* viii. 39 *ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν ἡ εὐδοκία εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Κύριε, σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, οὐ σαλευθησόμεθα ἔτι τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον.* This gives a meaning more appropriate to the context than to interpret *εὐδοκία* of human goodwill (as in *Ps. Sol.* iii. 4, xvi. 12), thus introducing the thought that the divine peace can only be bestowed where human goodwill is already present.

Gressmann (quoted in Klostermann) suggests that *εὐδοκίας* is due to a misreading of the Aramaic conjunction ו 'and' for the preposition ד 'of.' The original would thus have read 'Glory in the highest to God, and on earth peace to men, and goodwill.' But the appended 'and goodwill' is again awkward. If we follow the reading of the best Greek MSS. we obtain a good sense, though the rhythmical balance of the two clauses is poor.

15. *διέλθωμεν δή*] Lucan phraseology. *διέρχεσθαι* v. freq. in Luke and Acts, and cf. Ac. xv. 36 *ἐπιστρέψαντες δὴ ἐπισκεψώμεθα.*

*τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο τὸ γεγονός*] *ῥῆμα* again in the Hebraic sense of 'thing' or 'event.' Similarly in *v.* 17 *περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ λαληθέντος αὐτοῖς* does not mean 'concerning the word that had been spoken to them,' but 'concerning the matter which had been declared to them.'

18. *πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες*] Cf. *supra* i. 66 of 'all those who heard' the circumstances of the birth of John.

19. Mary is placed in a certain contrast to the shepherds. The shepherds published the tidings; Mary did not speak, but silently reflected upon what had happened. *ῥήματα* again means 'things,' not, as Klostermann tentatively suggests with a reference to the preceding verse, 'words.' *τὰ λαληθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμένων* would include both the angel's annunciation and its corroboration for them when they found Mary and Joseph and the babe. The latter was not *λαληθέν* for Mary. Mary reflected on the 'events,' of which the angel's appearance, related to her no doubt by the shepherds, was a part.

20. The shepherds returned to their flocks, praising God for what they had heard (*vv.* 10-14) and for what they had seen in confirmation (*ἴδωμεν v.* 15, *ἰδόντες v.* 17).

ὑπέστρεψαν οἱ ποιμένες δοξάζοντες καὶ αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἤκουσαν καὶ εἶδον καθὼς ἐλαλήθη πρὸς αὐτούς.

### The Circumcision of Jesus and his Presentation in the Temple (ii. 21-40)

The narrative continues in the spirit of traditional Jewish piety. The circumcision of Jesus is related, but it is not invested with any doctrinal significance. The emphasis falls upon the naming of the child in accordance with the angel's words to Mary. The Pauline thought of Christ as "born of a woman, born under the Law, that he might redeem those under the Law" (Gal. iv. 4 f.) is entirely absent. The circumcision is introduced simply as a part of customary Jewish observance. The same motive prompts the visit of the holy family to the Temple. The visit to the Temple affords the occasion for Symeon and the aged Hannah, representing the faithful piety of true Israelites, to recognise under divine guidance the fulfilment of the hope of Israel in the infant Jesus—a fulfilment which Symeon sees to be destined to bring light to all the world.

The presentation in the Temple was perhaps at some time a story in itself and was only later incorporated in a larger cycle. Symeon's action and words gain in meaning if they were originally the first intimation to the parents of the destiny of their child (cf. *v.* 33 n.).

The *motif* of an ancient sage welcoming the infant redeemer is found in the stories of the Buddha. For the different forms of the Buddhist story reference may be made to Windisch, *Brahmanischer Einfluss im Buddhismus*.[1] The earliest source for the legend is the Sutta-Nepâta, Mahâvagga 11 (Nâlaka-sutta).[2] The sage Asita hears the gods rejoicing over the birth of the Buddha. "The Bodhisatta," they cry, "the excellent pearl, the incomparable, is born for the good and for a blessing in the world of men, in the town of the Sakyas, in the country of Lumbinî. Therefore we are glad and exceedingly pleased." Asita descended from heaven and went to Suddhodana's palace and enquired of the Sakyas: "Where is the prince? I wish to see him." The Sakyas shewed him the child, and Asita, receiving him, cried in a loud voice, "Without superior is this, the most excellent of men."

It is held by some scholars that there is connexion of some kind between this story of the infancy of Christ and the story of the infancy of Buddha.[1] But this seems improbable. The theme of an old man anticipating the future of the divine child is in itself one that may easily have arisen independently. It has further been urged that the rejoicing of the gods over the birth of the infant Buddha finds a counterpart in the angelic hymn of Lk. ii. 14. But this seems rather to tell against the suggestion of dependence, for while the hymn of the gods and the visit of Asita to the Sakyas stand in organic connexion in the Buddhist story, there is no internal relation between their counterparts in the Christian story. Lastly, the tone of the Buddhist story is different from the Christian. Symeon is now ready to 'depart in peace,' since it has been vouchsafed to him to see the Lord's Christ. Asita, on the other hand, "remembering his own migration was displeased and shed tears." "My life here," he cried, "will shortly be at an end, in the middle (of his life) there will be death for me. I shall not hear the Dhamma of the incomparable one; therefore I am afflicted, unfortunate, and suffering" (Sutta-Nepâta, *op. cit.* p. 125).

---

[1] In *Aufsätze zur Kultur- u. Sprachgeschichte des Orients* dedicated to Ernst Kuhn, München, 1916, pp. 6 f.

[2] *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. x. pp. 123 f.

---

[1] So Garbe, *Indien und das Christentum*, with whom Charpentier, in a review in *Zeitsch. Deutsch. Morgendl. Gesell.*, 1915, p. 442, agrees. Against the theory of dependence, Bultmann, *G.S.T.* p. 180, and Clemen, *Rel. gesch. Erklärung d. N.T.* pp. 209 f. The latter gives full references to the literature.

21 Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, τὸ κληθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου πρὸ τοῦ συλλημφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ.

22 Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ

22 *αυτων* ℵB al pler: *αυτου* D al lat.vt (codd) syr.sin Aug: *αυτης* minusc perpauc

21. *τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτόν*] The fact of the circumcision of Jesus is implied, but in no way emphasised. The emphasis falls upon the naming of the child. On the association of the naming with the rite of circumcision cf. i. 59 n. Mary and Joseph are in a strange land. It is therefore natural that we should not hear here, as we do in the account of John's circumcision and naming, of the presence of neighbours and kinsfolk.

*καὶ ἐκλήθη*] *καί* (om. D 69 etc.) in apodosis according to Semitic idiom. Cf. Blass, § 77. 6.

*τὸ κληθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου*] The story here links up with the angelic Annunciation to Mary, i. 31.

22. *αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ*] According to the Law in Lev. xii. after the birth of a male child the mother was unclean for seven days, and was then confined to the house for a further period of thirty-three days. After these days of purification are ended, she is to bring her offering to the priest at the sanctuary.

*τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν*] *αὐτῶν*, the best attested reading, is difficult. The Law prescribes no purification for the husband. Probably *αὐτῶν* should

τὸν νόμον Μωυσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παρα-
στῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου ὅτι 23
Πᾶν ἄρϲεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήϲεται, καὶ
τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Κυρίου, 24
ζεῦγοϲ τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νοϲϲοὺϲ περιϲτερῶν. Καὶ ἰδοὺ
ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ ᾧ ὄνομα Συμεών, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρω- 25
πος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν

24 *νοσσους* ℵBO 69-124 etc: *νεοσσους* ADLϛ

be interpreted of the mother and child (so Orig.) rather than of Mary and Joseph (Plummer and others), since Luke proceeds to connect the visit of Mary to the Temple for her purification with the 'presentation' of the infant Jesus. This connexion seems to rest on an imperfect understanding of the legal requirement. Ex. xiii. 1-2 lays down the principle "Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is mine." Verse 13 then modifies this by prescribing redemption in the case of the first-born child. This was a different act from the purification of the mother. Besides the legal principle of Ex. xiii. from which Luke freely quotes (*πᾶν ἄρσεν . . . κληθήσεται*), Luke probably has in mind the presentation of Samuel at the sanctuary at Shiloh (1 Regn. i. 24 f.). Like Samuel, Jesus is solemnly dedicated by his parents to God, and in this dedication Luke sees a spiritual fulfilment of the legal principle (Ex. xiii.) that the first-born belongs to God. The legal provision of redemption by a substitute offering in the case of a child is passed over without notice.

*ἀνήγαγον*] i.e. from Bethlehem, where Mary had been confined, to Jerusalem.

23. *πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν*] The citation of this text shews, if it be necessary to shew, that the doctrine of the *partus clauso utero* (cf. *Protev.* xix f.) was unknown to the evangelist.

24. *ζεῦγος τρυγόνων . . . περιστερῶν*] Mary therefore comes under the rubric of Lev. xii. 8 that "if the woman's means suffice not for a lamb, then she shall take two turtledoves or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering."

*νοσσούς*] The vulgar form *νοσσούς* attested by ℵB and the Ferrar group is to be preferred to *νεοσσούς* of T.R. The same v.l. occurs in the LXX, Lev. v. 11, and xii. 8 (here quoted). Cf. Phryn. clxxxii. *Νοσσός, νοσσίον· ἀμφοῖν λείπει τὸ ε. διὰ τοῦτο ἀδόκιμα· λέγε οὖν νεοττός, νεοττίον ἵνα ἀρχαῖος φαίνῃ.*

25. The name Symeon was very common, and attempts to identify the man here intended, for instance as Symeon, the son of Hillel and father of Gamaliel, are necessarily precarious. The words of the *Nunc Dimittis* suggest that Symeon was an old man, though this is not directly stated by Luke.

*εὐλαβής*] 'devout.' The adj. is confined in N.T. to Luke, occurring also in Ac. ii. 5, viii. 2, xxii. 12. The noun *εὐλάβεια* occurs Heb. v. 7, xii. 28. The words occur in good Greek writers from Plato downwards with

26 τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν· καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ
κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου μὴ ἰδεῖν
27 θάνατον πρὶν [ἢ] ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν χριστὸν Κυρίου. καὶ ἦλθεν
ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς
γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸ
28 εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδέξατο αὐτὸ
εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἶπεν

29 Νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα,
κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ·

26 πριν η αν] om η B 36: om αν D al pler: εως αν ℵ al aliq

the meaning 'cautious,' 'caution.' In later Greek the words are especially used in connexion with religion: 'careful' or 'conscientious' in respect of religious duties. So Diod. Sic., Plut., Philo, LXX. See P.B. *s.v.*

προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ] Cf. Is. xl. 1 παρακαλεῖτε παρακαλεῖτε τὸν λαόν μου, λέγει ὁ θεός. Symeon was looking for the fulfilment of 'the hope of Israel.' S.B. ii. pp. 124 f. shew that the term was in frequent use among the Rabbis for the fulfilment of the Messianic hope.

καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν] 'and holy spirit was upon him.' The separation of πνεῦμα and ἅγιον by the verb ἦν is a somewhat unusual order, but Plummer presses the sentence too much in interpreting 'an influence which was holy was upon him.' There is no sufficient reason to distinguish sharply the meaning here from the meaning of the phrase πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθῆναι i. 15, i. 41, i. 67.

26. ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον] χρηματίζω, 'to give a divine response, oracle, or revelation' (Diod. Sic., Plut., Lucian, Joseph. etc. as well as LXX), may be used in the passive with the subject either, as here, of the revelation, or of the person to whom the revelation is made (so Mt. ii. 12, 22, Ac. x. 22, Heb. viii. 5, xi. 7).

πρὶν [ἢ] ἂν ἴδῃ] πρίν or πρὶν ἤ is constructed with the subj. here only in N.T. The constr. with the optat. is found only in Ac. xxv. 16. In both these Lucan passages πρίν correctly follows a preceding negative. Cf. Moulton, *Proleg.* i. p. 169; Blass, § 65. 10. The usual constr. of πρίν in N.T. is with accus. and aor. infin.

27. ἐν πνεύματι] The Spirit guides Symeon to enter the Temple at the right moment.

ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν] Aor. 'when his parents *had* brought in the child Jesus.'

28. καὶ αὐτός] Cf. καὶ ἐκλήθη *v.* 21 *supra* and note.

29-32. This beautiful hymn has been used in the evening services of the Church since the fifth century (*Apost. Constit.* vii. 48).

29. νῦν] Emphatic. *Now* Symeon has received the fulfilment of what, under God's guidance, he had looked for. The hymn corresponds closely to what has been stated before: κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου refers back to the divine promise (ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον *v.* 26), which Symeon now acknowledges to have been fulfilled: his eyes

ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου 30
ὃ ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, 31
φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν 32
καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.

καὶ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς 33

33 *ο πατηρ αυτου* ℵBDL 1-131 157 vg syr.sin aegg Orig: *Ιωσηφ* A al pler lat.vet syr.vg ϛ

have seen (*v.* 30) what it was promised he should see (*v.* 26), namely, the salvation of God, brought near in the Lord's Christ (*v.* 26).

*ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα*] "All three words shew that the figure is that of the manumission of a slave, or of his release from a long task. Death is the instrument of release" (Plummer). *ἀπολύω* is used in the O.T. of the deaths of Abraham (Gen. xv. 2), of Aaron (Num. xx. 29), of Tobit (Tob. iii. 6), of a martyr (2 Macc. vii. 9). Cf. also Epictet. i. 9. 16 *ὅταν ἐκεῖνος* (sc. *ὁ θεός*) *σημήνῃ καὶ ἀπολύσῃ ὑμᾶς ταύτης τῆς ὑπηρεσίας, τότ' ἀπελεύσεσθε πρὸς αὐτόν.*

*δέσποτα*] Rarely used of God in N.T. Cf. Ac. iv. 24, Rev. vi. 10. See also Job v. 8 *κύριον δὲ τὸν πάντων δεσπότην ἐπικαλέσομαι*, Wisdom vi. 7, viii. 3, Ecclus. xxxvi. 1, 3 Macc. ii. 2, and fairly frequently in the LXX (about thirteen times) as a rendering of אֲדֹנָי,אָדוֹן.

*ἐν εἰρήνῃ*] Placed emphatically at the end to correspond to the opening *νῦν*. "It is the peace of completeness, of work finished and hopes fulfilled" (Plummer). Cf. Gen. xv. 15 (of Abraham) *σὺ δὲ ἀπελεύσῃ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας σου μετ' εἰρήνης, τραφεὶς ἐν γήρει καλῷ.*

30. *εἶδον . . . τὸ σωτήριόν σου*] The *παράκλησις* (*v.* 25) for which Symeon had looked, and which Isaiah had prophesied (xl. 1), is now visible. Cf. Is. in the same chapter, *v.* 5 *καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα Κυρίου, καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.* (Quoted below, iii. 6.)

31. The salvation is for all mankind. Cf. Is. lii. 10 *καὶ ἀποκαλύψει Κύριος τὸν βραχίωνα τὸν ἅγιον αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, καὶ ὄψονται πάντα ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.*

32. *φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν . . . καὶ δόξαν*] It is doubtful whether *φῶς* and *δόξαν* should be taken as two coordinates in apposition to *σωτήριον*, or whether *φῶς* alone should be regarded as in apposition to *σωτήριον* with *ἀποκάλυψιν* and *δόξαν* as parallel statements of the illumination which the salvation brings about. The former seems to suit the language equally well with the latter, and is perhaps in closer agreement with the thought of the Gospel: the Messianic salvation brings out the full and true glory of Israel and sheds universal light upon all the peoples of the world.

*φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν*] 'a light to give revelation for the Gentiles.' So of the Lord's servant in Is. xlix. 6 *δέδωκά σε . . . εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν*, and *ib.* xlii. 6 *ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν.*

33. *καὶ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες*] The wonder of the parents should not be understood to arise only from the *universal*

34 λαλουμένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεὼν
καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Μαριὰμ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Ἰδοὺ οὗτος
κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ
35 καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον, καὶ σοῦ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν
διελεύσεται ῥομφαία, ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν

35 και σου] add δε ℵD al pler Orig ς : sine addit BLΞ

character of the redemption implied in the last words of Symeon's hymn; they wonder at the whole of what is said in connexion with the child. The 'wonder' of the parents is certainly very naturally in place, if we suppose, with Loisy, Bultmann, and others, that this narrative once stood by itself and described the first intimation to the parents of the character and destiny of their child.

Note that Joseph is spoken of as ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ without especial notice or qualification.

34-35. οὗτος κεῖται] This child is appointed for a mission which will cause many to fall and many to rise in Israel. This is the twofold outcome of the advent of the Christ. Some reject him and fall, others receive him and rise. It may be that the two texts of Isaiah concerning the stone of stumbling (viii. 14) and the precious corner-stone on which "he that believeth shall not be put to shame" (xxviii. 16, cf. Ro. ix. 33) lie behind the thought of the passage. Cf. xx. 17 f. with note *ad loc.*

This is a more satisfactory interpretation than to suppose that the πτῶσις and the ἀνάστασις represent the penitence and the restoration of the same persons. J. Weiss suggests that καὶ ἀνάστασιν is the insertion of an editor. Its omission would make a closer connexion with the next clause καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον, but the contrasted terms πτῶσις and ἀνάστασις must surely be original.

Elsewhere in the N.T. ἀνάστασις is always used of the resurrection of the dead.

εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον] Jesus is a sign to Israel (cf. xi. 30), but a sign which meets with contradiction.

καὶ σοῦ αὐτῆς . . . ῥομφαία] This clause, addressed to Mary personally, is a parenthesis which seems to break the connexion, since the last clause ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν κτλ. must refer back to *v.* 34. Perhaps it was not present in an earlier source, but was inserted by the evangelist, who, on this view, is likely also to be responsible for making Symeon address his prophecy to Mary alone. (So Loisy.) The words describe the grief of the *mater dolorosa.* The link with the preceding sentence is probably to be found in the thought of the passion of Christ, implied, though not explicitly foretold, in the word ἀντιλεγόμενον. Mary's heart will be pierced by the suffering which will fall upon her son. This seems better than to suppose with Origen and some moderns (Reuss and Bleek) that the sword is a sword of doubt which will pierce Mary, as though even she were to be tempted to join the ἀντιλέγοντες. For the wording cf. *Orac. Sib.* iii. 316 ῥομφαία γὰρ διελεύσεται διὰ μέσον σεῖο (i.e. Egypt).

ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν κτλ.] By the response which they make

*καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί.* Καὶ ἦν Ἅννα προφῆτις, 36
*θυγάτηρ Φανουήλ, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσήρ, (αὕτη προβεβηκυῖα
ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς, ζήσασα μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἔτη ἑπτὰ ἀπὸ
τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς, καὶ αὐτὴ χήρα ἕως ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα* 37
*τεσσάρων,) ἣ οὐκ ἀφίστατο τοῦ ἱεροῦ νηστείαις καὶ δεή-
σεσιν λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν. καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ* 38
*ἐπιστᾶσα ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ
πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ.*

Καὶ ὡς ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον Κυρίου, 39
*ἐπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς πόλιν ἑαυτῶν Ναζαρέτ.*

Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ηὔξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πληρούμενον 40
*σοφίᾳ, καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό.*

to the Christ, the thoughts of men's hearts will stand revealed.

36-38. The aged prophetess Anna is a counterpart to Symeon. No detail is given of what she said when she encountered the holy family. She is represented as a devoted widow like the faithful widows of the Church (1 Tim. v. 5 *ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα . . . προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσι καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας*). Perhaps she is thought of as actually living within the temple precincts. She speaks of the child to a group of like-minded faithful Israelites who 'looked for the redemption of Jerusalem.'

36. *αὕτη προβεβηκυῖα κτλ.*] The clause is awkwardly expressed, and the construction is uncertain. *ἦν* should probably be supplied with *προβεβηκυῖα*. The words *καὶ αὐτὴ χήρα . . . τεσσάρων* can scarcely be taken to mean that after her husband's death she had lived for eighty-four years as a widow, since this would make her incredibly and unsuitably aged. We are to understand that she was eighty-four years of age, and after a brief married life of seven years had continued a widow. Cf. Judith viii. 4 f., xvi. 22 f.

38. The language is characteristically Lucan: *αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐπιστᾶσα, προσδεχομένοις* (cf. also Mk. xv. 43). *ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι*] 'to render thanks to God,' here only in N.T.

39. The parents return to 'their own city,' Nazareth. Note the contrast with the course of events in Mt., where Nazareth does not come into the story until after the return of the holy family from Egypt.

40. Compare the account of the growth of the Baptist in i. 80. The words in each case are carefully chosen. John 'waxes strong in spirit' in a desert life. Jesus remains in the home circle, 'filled with wisdom' and blessed by the grace of God.

## AN INCIDENT IN THE BOYHOOD OF JESUS (ii. 41-52)

A single incident from the boyhood of Jesus illustrates his 'growth in wisdom' (*vv.* 40, 52) and makes a transition from the infancy to the public ministry. It is in keeping with the psychological and biographical interest of Luke to introduce a link of this kind. Moreover, the story furthers his literary aim of giving a continuous and connected narrative.

The origin of the story cannot be recovered. It seems not to presuppose the experiences of Mary and Joseph related before (cf. *v.* 50), and perhaps derives from a different cycle of tradition.

Stories somewhat similar in type about the boyhood of great men are found elsewhere in ancient biographical literature. Such are the stories of the boyhood of Cyrus (Hdt. i. 114 f.), of Alexander (Plut. *Alex.* 5), of Apollonius (Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* i. 7). Compare also the accounts of the childhood of Moses in Jos. *Ant.* ii. 9. 6, and Philo, *Vita Mos.* i. p. 83 M. But the closest parallel to the Lucan narrative is the account which Josephus gives of his own boyhood (*Vita* 2). When still a boy of about fourteen years of age, so Josephus relates of himself, his learning was of such repute that he was praised by the chief priests and rulers of the city, when they met together, for the accurate knowledge of the Law which he displayed.

The narrative in the Gospel is free from any thought of pride of learning. By his questions and his answers Jesus shews himself master of the subjects which the Rabbis were discussing. But the central idea of the narrative is disclosed when his parents find him and question him concerning his behaviour. He must be in his Father's house, and—so we may interpret—he must become master of the ancient revelation which his Father had given to Israel and which he was to fulfil. By the words ' in my Father's house ' Jesus is shewn as conscious, from boyhood, of a unique sonship to God. This lays upon him duties which may call him from his parents, and even bring some note of discord into his relations with them. But the discord is only momentary. Mary ponders quietly over the words of her son, and the son returns to live in obedience to his parents in the home at Nazareth.

The mother of Jesus appears but once more in the Lucan Gospel. The occasion is when she with her other sons comes to visit Jesus during his ministry and calls forth the saying " My mother and my brethren are they who hear the word of God and do it " (viii. 19 f.). But in Luke we are not told, as we are in his Marcan source, that " his mother and his brethren came to take him, for they said (*or* for it was said) ' he is beside himself.' "

41 Καὶ ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ᾽ ἔτος εἰς Ἰερουσα-

41 *οι γονεις αυτου* e f vg Aug : Joseph et Maria a b al : his kinsfolk syrr.

41. *καὶ ἐπορεύοντο . . . τοῦ πάσχα*] The Law prescribed attendance at the three great feasts in the central sanctuary for all male Israelites.

λὴμ τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, 42
ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς καὶ τελειω- 43
σάντων τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτοὺς ὑπέμεινεν
Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς
αὐτοῦ. νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ ἦλθον 44
ἡμέρας ὁδὸν καὶ ἀνεζήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν καὶ
τοῖς γνωστοῖς, καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ 45
ἀναζητοῦντες αὐτόν. καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς εὗρον 46
αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καθεζόμενον ἐν μέσῳ τῶν διδασκάλων
καὶ ἀκούοντα αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπερωτῶντα αὐτούς· ἐξίσταντο δὲ 47
πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀπο-
κρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεπλάγησαν, καὶ εἶπεν 48
πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ Τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν
οὕτως; ἰδοὺ ὁ πατήρ σου καὶ ἐγὼ ὀδυνώμενοι ζητοῦμέν

43 εγνωσαν οι γονεις αυτου ℵBDLΘ 1 etc 33 157 a e vg aegg Aug: his kinsfolk etc. syr.sin: εγνω Ιωσηφ και η μητηρ αυτου AC al pler b f syr (vg.hl)ϛ
48 ο πατηρ σου και εγω om a b syr.cur

The attendance of women was not prescribed in the Law, and the question of the appearance of women and children at the feasts was at some early period a matter of controversy. See S.B. ii. p. 142.

42. ἐτῶν δώδεκα] The age of adolescence.

ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν] ἀναβαίνειν, a quasi-technical term for 'going up' to a feast. Cf. Jo. xii. 20. The present tense of the participle (contrast τελειωσάντων) is appropriate to the meaning 'on the occasion of their visit to Jerusalem for the feast.' τὰς ἡμέρας] i.e. the seven days of the feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread.

43. ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς] The evangelist gives no account of how Jesus and his parents became separated in Jerusalem. The sequel shews that the child himself had taken the initiative.

44. ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ] 'in the caravan.' Here only in N.T. The word is found in Strabo, Epictetus, Josephus, and inscrr. See P.B. *s.v.*

46. μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς] A reckoning is probably intended from the time of the parents' departure. On the first day they travelled homeward, on the second day they returned, and on the third they found him. So Grotius. εὗρον αὐτόν] How the boy had been living in the meantime we are not told.

ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ] The scene appears to be some chamber in the temple buildings where scribes met for teaching and discussion. It seems that the boy is attending some general discussion between a group of teachers. He listens to what is said, and himself asks questions on the points in debate. *The Gospel of Thomas* (*c.* xix.) makes the boy Jesus reduce the teachers to silence and himself expound the law. In Luke the boy is a genuine learner.

48. The parents are struck with amazement. The mother first finds words of enquiry and gentle rebuke.

49 *σε. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε*
50 *ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με; καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ*
51 *συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς. καὶ κατέβη μετ᾽ αὐ-*
*τῶν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέτ, καὶ ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς.*
*καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*
52 *αὐτῆς.* *Καὶ Ἰησοῦς* προέκοπτεν *τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ*
καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

49. *τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με;*] The interpretation of these words depends on the interpretation of *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου* below. If we interpret the latter to mean 'in my Father's house'—the more probable rendering—the meaning is that it ought to have been unnecessary for the parents to *search*, they should have known where to look. But *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου* might mean 'about my Father's affairs.' In that case this question will express surprise that they should have been at all anxious about his absence. This, however, seems to fit the sequel of the story less easily. The time had not yet come for Jesus to leave his parents' care and protection.

*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου εἶναι*] A possible rendering is 'to be about my Father's business.' Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 15 *ταῦτα μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι*, and 1 Cor. vii. 33 *τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου*, but a better sense is given if we interpret 'to be in my Father's home.' See above. Cf. Gen. xli. 51 *ἐκάλεσεν δὲ Ἰωσὴφ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πρωτοτόκου Μαννασσὴ λέγων Ὅτι ἐπιλαθέσθαι με ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς πάντων τῶν πόνων μου καὶ πάντων τῶν τοῦ πατρός μου.* It may be doubted whether the narrator was conscious of an antithesis between *ὁ πατήρ σου* in Mary's words (*v.* 48) and *τοῦ πατρός μου* in the mouth of Jesus.

50. *καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνῆκαν*] The story takes no account of what has been related above concerning Mary and Joseph at the time of the birth of Jesus.

*τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς*] *ῥῆμα* here means 'word' or 'saying.'

51. Jesus returns with his parents to Nazareth, and, in spite of his consciousness that he was God's son, he remains in subjection to his earthly parents.

*πάντα τὰ ῥήματα*] 'all that had happened,' as above in *v.* 19.

52. The development of Jesus is again noted (cf. *v.* 40), and again with emphasis upon his *σοφία*. The concluding words of the chapter on the childhood of Christ echo once more the account of the child Samuel: 1 Regn. ii. 26 *καὶ τὸ παιδάριον Σαμουὴλ ἐπορεύετο, καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ μετὰ Κυρίου καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων.*

*ἡλικίᾳ*] The word may mean either 'stature' or 'age.' The former must be intended here, for it goes without saying that Jesus grew older.

### THE MISSION OF JOHN THE BAPTIST (iii. 1-20)

In the mind of the early Church, the preaching and baptizing of John was the beginning of the Christian Gospel. Cf. Acts i. 22, x. 37, xiii. 24. Both Mark and Q, Luke's principal sources, open with John's mission, and the same perspective is retained in the fourth Gospel.

Luke, like Matthew, draws mainly on Q (*vv.* 7-9, 16-17), which is reproduced with only slight variations in the two Gospels. The account of John's preaching in Q may be taken to preserve an original impression. "So may John in fact have spoken" (Ed. Meyer). Bultmann estimates the source very differently: the words were 'threats of judgement' (*Drohworte*), which circulated in early Christian tradition and were "put into the mouth of the Baptist, because it was desired to relate a portion of his preaching of repentance. . . . It may be regarded as a pure accident that Jesus is not the speaker of these threats of judgement" (*G.S.T.* p. 71). This appears to be a very arbitrary treatment of the tradition. Though we have no reason to assume that the accounts in the synoptic Gospels give a *verbatim* report of the Baptist's words, there appears to be no good reason why we should not suppose these accounts to reproduce authentic tradition of his preaching. The proclamation of imminent judgement, the call for repentance, and the repudiation of national privilege recall classical passages of Hebrew prophecy, but the language is freshly minted. Josephus in his account of John (*Ant.* xviii. 5. 2) does not refer to the eschatological element in John's preaching, and he gives a somewhat different interpretation of John's Baptism (see Additional Note), but his statement that John required of the Jews that they should practise δικαιοσύνη towards one another and εὐσέβεια towards God may be taken as a Greek rendering of the preaching of repentance. The statement in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 105, that "the true text of Josephus represents him as preaching first to a body of 'ascetics,' and afterwards to others," rests on a mistranslation of Josephus's Greek (see *J.Th.S.*, Oct. 1921, p. 59). In Josephus, as in the Gospels, John addresses himself to the nation.

A comparison of the full treatment of John in Q with the treatment in Mark (and in John) shews the natural tendency of Christians to regard John solely as a forerunner and witness of Christ. Luke is following Q, and the Marcan source naturally falls into the background, but the influence of Mark may be traced in the wording of *v.* 3 and of *v.* 16 (*vide ad loc.*). It is noteworthy that Luke (with Matthew) omits here the quotation from Mal. iii. 1 (wrongly combined in Mark with Is. xl. 3 as a quotation from 'Isaiah the prophet'), perhaps because Q here gave Is. xl. 3 alone. Mal. iii. 1 is quoted of John in Lk. vii. 27 (=Mt. xi. 10 Q). Luke also drops the picturesque details of John's dress and food (Mk. i. 6; Mt. iii. 4).

The matter of *vv.* 10-14 (the questions of the multitude, the publicans, and the soldiers) is peculiar to Luke. Idiomatic Greek words in these verses (see notes) contrast with the Semitic colouring of the Q material and render it probable that these verses did not stand in Q. It is not necessary to assume a special source. Luke is interested in 'multitudes,' in publicans, and in soldiers, and it was worth while to shew that the same classes who were brought into contact with Jesus came also to John. The teaching of Jesus in the great sermon (*c.* vi.), his praise of the centurion (*c.* vii.), and his welcome of Zacchaeus (*c.* xix.) are prepared for; but the replies of John to the different classes fall short of their counterparts in the life and teaching of Jesus.

Luke has set his material in an editorial framework. He begins with an elaborate dating of the beginning of the preaching of John (*v.* 1). The quotation from Isaiah is extended to include a prophecy of salvation for all flesh (*vv.* 5, 6). John's proclamation of the mightier one to come is prefaced by a statement that it was delivered in answer to a question which was in all hearts as to whether John were himself the Christ. The suggestion that John was taken by some to be the Christ is only found elsewhere in the fourth Gospel (i. 20). Finally, Luke concludes the section with a statement of John's imprisonment by Antipas. This replaces the reference to John's imprisonment, omitted from the Marcan source, at the opening of the Galilean ministry (iv. 14).

III. 1 EN ETEI *δὲ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου*

1. Luke, writing as a historian, fixes the date of John's mission in relation to general history by giving the year of the reigning Emperor and the contemporary rulers, civil and ecclesiastical, of Palestine and the neighbouring tetrarchies. Cf. Thuc. ii. 2, of the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, τῷ δὲ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει, ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἄργει τότε πεντήκοντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης καὶ Αἰνησίου ἐφόρου ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ Πυθοδώρου ἔτι δύο μῆνας ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοις.

ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος] Augustus died August 19 A.D. 14. No doubt Luke, like Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 2. 2; 6. 10), reckons the reign of Tiberius from this date, which gives A.D. 28-29 for his fifteenth year. Ussher's theory (*Annales V. et N. Test.* ed. Clericus 1722, pp. 579, 586), that the reign of Tiberius was reckoned from the date (end of A.D. 11 or beginning of A.D. 12) when he was associated with Augustus as joint ruler, has been revived by Wieseler, Zahn, and others. This would enable us to reconcile more exactly the birth of Jesus under Herod the Great (died 4 B.C.) with his being 'about thirty years of age' at the time of his baptism by John (iii. 23). But it does not accord with the usage of other writers or with the reckoning adopted on coins. It has been shown by Eckhel (*De doctr. numm. vet.* iii. pp. 276 ff.) that the evidence of Antiochene coins, which were supposed to shew this reckoning, should not be admitted.

Καίσαρος, ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πειλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρῴδου, Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, καὶ Λυσανίου τῆς Ἀβειληνῆς τετρα-

1 *ηγεμονευοντος*] *επιτροπευοντος* D Eus Chron. Pasch. procurante latt

ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πειλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας] ἡγεμών is a general term which may be used of subordinate governors (Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3. 1 Πιλᾶτος ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἡγεμών) as well as of emperors (*Ant.* xviii. 2. 2). For ἡγεμονεύοντος D substitutes the exact term ἐπιτροπεύοντος. Pilate was ἐπίτροπος = procurator of Judaea and Samaria under the imperial *legatus pro praetore* of Syria. He was in office A.D. 26-36. Judaea and Samaria had been under the rule of a procurator since the deposition of Archelaus in A.D. 6.

τετρααρχοῦντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρῴδου] Herod Antipas, son of Herod the Great and Malthake, became tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea in 4 B.C. on the death of his father (*Ant.* xvii. 11. 4; *B.J.* ii. 6. 3). He remained in office till A.D. 39, when he was banished by Caligula in consequence of an attempt to exchange his title of tetrarch for the higher title of king. Mark (vii. 14, 26) speaks of him as βασιλεύς, but this is an inaccuracy. It is conceivable that Luke connected the title τετραάρχης with the *four* territories which he specifies. This would accord with the original usage of the term (Eur. *Alc.* 1154, cf. Strabo 430 of Thessaly; Strabo 560, 567 of the divisions of Galatia). But it had come to be used as a general term for a subordinate native ruler (*B.J.* i. 24. 5; Hor. *Sat.* i. 3. 12). The kingdom of Herod the Great had been partitioned between one ἐθνάρχης (Archelaus) and two τετράαρχαι (Antipas and Philip).

Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τετρααρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας] Philip, son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra, was the best of the Herods. He was tetrarch from 4 B.C. till his death in A.D. 33 or 34 over a territory including Trachonitis, Gaulonitis, Batanea and Panias (*Ant.* xvii. 8. 1, xviii. 4. 6). The Ituraeans were a race of highland freebooters who had their headquarters in Lebanon (Strabo, pp. 753, 755, 756), which was no part of Philip's tetrarchy; but Panias (refounded by Philip as Caesarea Philippi) had belonged to the Ituraean kingdom (*Ant.* xv. 10. 3), and thus partly justifies Luke's description. Schürer, *G.J.V.* i. pp. 426, 716.

Λυσανίου τῆς Ἀβειληνῆς τετρααρχοῦντος] On the identity of this Lysanias see Addit. Note.

ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα καὶ Καιάφα] The singular ἀρχιερέως rightly suggests that there could only be one high priest, but the combination of the two names is strange. Loisy suggests that the words καὶ Καιάφα may be a later addition. Like Mark, Luke does not give the name of Caiaphas in connexion with the trial of Jesus, and in Acts iv. 6 Annas is described as high priest. Luke appears not to have exact information as to the high priesthood. Annas (Ananos) had held office from A.D. 6-15, when he was deposed by Gratus (*Ant.* xviii. 2. 1-2). Joseph

2 ἀρχοῦντος, ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἅννα καὶ Καιάφα, ἐγένετο ῥῆμα
3 θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάνην τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. καὶ
ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βά-
4 πτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν
βίβλῳ λόγων Ἠσαίου τοῦ προφήτου

Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου,
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

4 αυτου] υμων D: for our God syrr: dei nostri Iren (lat) cf. LXX Is. xl. 3 του θεου ημων

Caiaphas, who tried the Lord (Mt. xxvi. 57; Jo. xviii. 24), held office A.D. 18-36 (*Ant.* xviii. 2. 2; 4. 3). Acc. to Jo. xviii. 13 he was son-in-law to Annas. Five sons of Annas held the high priesthood, one before and four after Caiaphas. Annas doubtless retained great influence, and this may account for Luke's misapprehension.

2. ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάνην] The phraseology, which is peculiar to Luke, recalls LXX. Cf. Jer. i. 1 τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὃ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Ἰερεμίαν τὸν τοῦ Χελκίου.

ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ] In all the Gospels the words of Isaiah xl. 3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ are applied to John, and in the three synoptists John is associated with ἡ ἔρημος. But the topography is vague. Acc. to Mark John was baptizing ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Cf. Lk. vii. 24 = Mt. xi. 7 (Q). The Jordan valley, which is not sandy desert, is described as ἐρημία in Jos. *B.J.* iii. 10. 7. Mt. defines the desert as ἡ ἔρημος τῆς Ἰουδαίας, but this did not border on the Jordan. Lk. represents John as receiving his call ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ—no doubt the desert of Judaea W. of the Dead Sea, cf. i. 80—and then coming out to preach throughout the valley of the Jordan. Schmidt, *R.G.J.* p. 22, thinks that all the references to 'desert' in connexion with John are due to the literary influence of Is. xl. But it is hard to suppose that the words in Lk. vii. 24 (Q) derive from a purely literary motif.

3. κηρύσσων . . . ἁμαρτιῶν] Exactly as in Mark.

On John's baptism see Additional Note.

μετάνοια] The Greek word is not used in LXX (except 5 times in Wisdom Lit.). Here it will represent Aram. תוב = Heb. שוב 'turn.' John reasserts the idea, fundamental to the prophetic religion of O.T., of 'turning' away from sin (1 Ki. viii. 47, xiii. 33; Ps. lxxviii. 34; Is. vi. 10; Ezek. iii. 19, etc.) and towards God (2 Ki. xxiii. 25; Amos iv. 6, 8, etc.). The etymological meaning of the Greek word 'change of mind' should not be pressed. μετάνοια, μετανοεῖν can be used in prof. Gk. to express specifically 'repentance' after wrongdoing. Thuc. iii. 36. 3; Attalus II. in Dittenberger, *Or. Inscr.* 751 θεωρῶν οὖν ὑμᾶς μετανενοηκότας τε ἐπὶ τοῖς προημαρτημένοις κτλ.; Plut. *De soll. anim.* 961 D; Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 11. 3.

4-6. Lk. like Mt. omits here the Marcan citation of Mal. iii. 1 (cf., however, vii. 27 = Mt. xi. 10). He extends the quotation from Is. xl. no doubt in order to include the promise of universal salvation in the last line. As in Mk. (and Mt.) τὰς

πᾶϲα φάραγξ πληρωθήϲεται 5
καὶ πᾶν ὄροϲ καὶ βουνὸϲ ταπεινωθήϲεται,
καὶ ἔϲται τὰ ϲκολιὰ εἰϲ εὐθείαϲ
καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰϲ ὁδοὺϲ λείαϲ·
καὶ ὄψεται πᾶϲα ϲὰρξ τὸ ϲωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. 6

*Ἔλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ'* 7
*αὐτοῦ Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ*
*τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους* 8
*τῆς μετανοίας· καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Πατέρα*

7 *υπ' αυτου*] *ενωπιον αυτου* D; coram ipso b l*q r; in conspectu eius d e; to him to be baptized syrr (sin.vg); syr.cur om to be baptized

*τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* of LXX becomes *τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ*, which leaves open the application of *Κυρίου* to the Messiah. (*τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* was read here by syrr Iren.lat, and is defended by Zahn as original, but it is probably due to assimilation to LXX.) Otherwise the text follows LXX with minor variations and the omission of a clause *καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα Κυρίου* before *καὶ ὄψεται κτλ.* The original prophecy (in which 'in the desert' is to be constructed with 'prepare,' not with 'that cries') calls for the preparation of a high road by which captive Israel may cross a literal desert. Luke intends a moral interpretation of the material obstacles.

7. Mt. makes John address the Pharisees and Sadducees. The combination, which is certainly not original in Mt. xvi. 1 (cf. Mk. viii. 11), is likely to be editorial in Mt. iii. 7. If, as seems probable, Lk. preserves the original sense of Q, John was represented as rebuking the superficial repentance of the multitude. But *ὄχλοι* are characteristic of Luke: xi. 15 (= Mt. xii. 24); xi. 29 (= Mt. xii. 38, 39); xii. 54 (cf. Mt. xvi. 1).

*ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*] The reading *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ*, suggesting that the penitents baptized themselves, may be original.

7b-9 with 16b-17 are almost verbally identical with Mt. iii. 7b-12 (Q). Mark gives only an equivalent for the prophecy of 'the mightier one' (*vv.* 16b-17).

*Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν*] 'Vipers.' *γενν.* is not to be pressed. (Nestlé, *Z.N.T.W.*, 1913, pp. 267 f.)

*τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς*] 'The wrath to come' (or 'the judgement') is a ruling idea of the Jewish religion (cf. Enoch 90; Strack-Billerbeck, i. p. 115; Volz. *Jüd. Esch.* pp. 268 f.) having its source in the prophetic teaching (Is. xiii. 9, xxx. 27; Zeph. ii. 2; Mal. iii. 2, iv. 1, 5). It is presupposed by Jesus (Lk. x. 14 = Mt. xi. 22; Lk. xi. 31 = Mt. xii. 42) and by Paul (Rom. i. 18, ii. 5, v. 9; 1 Thess. i. 10 *Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης*).

8. *ποιήσατε οὖν καρπούς*] Semitic. Gen. i. 11 ff., cf. Mk. iv. 32; James iii. 12. The Gk. text of [Aristot.] *De plantis* adduced by Klostermann and McNeile on Mt. iii. 8 as authority for the phrase in Gk. is a mediaeval retrans. of a Latin vers. of an Arabic vers. of an orig. Gk. work assigned by Meyer to Nicolas of Damascus. See Christ, *Griech. Lit.-Gesch.* p. 486.

*ἄρξησθε*] Mt. *δόξητε*. A weak use of *ἄρχομαι* is frequent in Luke, though he tends to avoid Mark's use

ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι δύναται ὁ θεὸς
9 ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. ἤδη δὲ
καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται· πᾶν οὖν
δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν [καλὸν] ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ
10 βάλλεται. καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες Τί
11 οὖν ποιήσωμεν; ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Ὁ ἔχων δύο
χιτῶνας μεταδότω τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι, καὶ ὁ ἔχων βρώματα
12 ὁμοίως ποιείτω. ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τελῶναι βαπτισθῆναι καὶ
13 εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν· Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσωμεν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν

9 καλον om a ff$^2$ vg (A al) Iren$^{\text{lat.codd.pler}}$ Orig

of the vb. as a mere auxiliary. The weak use may be, but is not necessarily, an Aramaism. See J. W. Hunkin, *J.Th.S.* xxv. p. 390. Norden (*Antike Kunst-Prosa*, ii. 487) regards ἄρξησθε here as a stylistic improvement of an original δόξητε.

πατέρα . . . τὸν Ἀβραάμ] For the assumption of national privilege here repudiated cf. Jo. viii. 33; Rom. ii. 17-29; Justin, *Dial.* 140 οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν . . . ὑπολαμβάνοντες ὅτι πάντως τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς σπορᾶς τῆς κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ οὖσι, κἂν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὦσι καὶ ἄπιστοι καὶ ἀπειθεῖς πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἡ βασιλεία ἡ αἰώνιος δοθήσεται; Strack-Billerbeck, i. 119.

τῶν λίθων τούτων] These lifeless stones. There was perhaps a play on the words בניא and אבניא 'sons' and 'stones.'

9. ἤδη δὲ καί κτλ.] The judgement is imminent. For the metaphor of the axe cf. Is. x. 33. δὲ καί (Mt. δέ) is very common in Lk. to give emphasis, cf. *v.* 12. The omission of καλόν improves the sense. Every unfruitful tree is to be felled.

10. ἐπηρώτων] The imperf. here does not imply repetition (so Plummer) and does not differ in force from the aorist εἶπαν in *v.* 12. Cf. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 57; Blass, § 57. 4.

11. John's plain injunction of care for the needy (cf. Is. lviii. 7) may be contrasted with the paradoxical teaching of Jesus, vi. 29. Two χιτῶνες might be worn together in travelling (*Ant.* xvii. 5, 7) but were not both essential (Mk. vi. 9 and par.).

12, 13. John's preaching reaches members of a class which Jewish orthodoxy regarded as outside the pale. He enjoins upright dealing but does not require that they should abandon their profession. τελῶναι or δημοσιῶναι (from Lat. *publicani*) were collectors of dues, which were farmed out by the state (Schürer, i. p. 478). The τελῶναι of the N.T. will be in the main subordinate agents. Zacchaeus (xix. 2) is an ἀρχιτελώνης. Their opportunities for exaction are well illustrated by a Palmyrene inscr. of A.D. 137 (Ditt. *Or. Inscr.* 629): the tribute payable was regulated partly by law and partly by custom. Disputes between merchants and τελῶναι led the βουλή of Palmyra to draw up a fixed tariff of the tribute due by custom and to authorise the magistrates ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ μηδὲν παραπράσσειν τὸν μισθούμενον. τελῶναι as a class were held in low esteem both by Jews (Mk. ii. 15; Mt. xi. 19 = Lk. vii. 34; quotations in S.-B. i. p. 378)

*πρὸς αὐτούς Μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν*
*πράσσετε. ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ στρατευόμενοι λέγοντες* 14
*Τί ποιήσωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Μηδένα διασείσητε*
*μηδὲ συκοφαντήσητε, καὶ ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς ὀψωνίοις*
*ὑμῶν. Προσδοκῶντος δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ διαλογιζομένων* 15
*πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάνου,*
*μή ποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ χριστός, ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ* 16
*Ἰωάνης Ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ*
*ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν*
*ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*

16 *αγιω* om 63 64 Clem Tert Aug

and Gentiles. Herodas vi. 64 *τοὺς γὰρ τελώνας πᾶσα νῦν θύρη φρίσσει*; Lucian, *Nekyo.* 11 *μοιχοὶ καὶ πορνοβόσκοι καὶ τελῶναι καὶ κόλακες καὶ συκοφάνται κτλ.*

14. There is nothing to shew whether the soldiers are to be thought of as Jewish soldiers of Antipas or as Romans under the Procurator. Lagrange suggests that they were armed supporters of the *τελῶναι* and that *καὶ ἡμεῖς* implies 'we too who are engaged in this business.' *διασείειν* = 'rob by violence' (cf. 3 Macc. vii. 21), *συκοφαντεῖν* 'rob by false accusation.' For the combination cf. Antiph. *Or.* vi. 43 *ἑτέρους τῶν ὑπευθύνων ἔσειε καὶ ἐσυκοφάντει*; P.Par. 61 (*Notices et Extraits*, xviii. 2, 351) of complaints against *τελῶναι—μάλιστα δὲ κατὰ τῶν πρὸς ταῖς τελωνίαις ἐντυγχανόντων, περί τε διασεισμῶν καὶ παραλογειῶν, ἐνίων δὲ καὶ συκοφαντεῖσθαι προφερομένων.* For John's advice cf. Josephus, *Vita* 47 *συνεβούλευον πρὸς μηδένα μήτε πολεμεῖν μήτε ἁρπαγῇ μολύνειν τὰς χεῖρας, ἀλλὰ σκηνοῦν κατὰ τὸ πεδίον ἀρκουμένους τοῖς ἐφοδίοις.*

15. *εἴη*] The optat. in indirect question (peculiar to Luke in N.T.) gives "the tone of remoteness and uncertainty," Moulton, *Prol.* p. 199.

16. *ἀπεκρίνατο*] In Bibl. Gk. aor. middle of *ἀποκρίνομαι* generally yields to passive. But see also xxiii. 9; Mt. xxvii. 12; Mk. xiv. 61; Jo. v. 17, 19; and in LXX, 3 Ki. ii. 1; 1 Chron. x. 13; Ezek. ix. 11.

John foretells the coming of one mightier than himself, for whom he is unworthy to perform even the duties of a slave. *ὁ ἰσχυρότερος*] Not 'that mightier one' but 'one who is mightier.' The use of the art. is Semitic. See Wellh. *Einl.* p. 19. *οὗ . . . αὐτοῦ* also a Semitism. Cf. Mk. vii. 25.

*λῦσαι . . . αὐτοῦ*] Mt. *τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι.* So prob. Q. Lk. here agrees with Mk. (with omission of *κύψας*). To undo and to carry shoes or sandals was the duty of a slave. Cf. Plaut. *Trin.* ii. 1. 22 'sandaligerulae.'

*αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί*] *ἁγίῳ* is possibly not orig. in Lk. See crit. note. Mark has *βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* (without *καὶ πυρί*) and does not give the next verse. A similar form of the saying is ascribed to Jesus, Acts i. 5, xi. 16. The saying in this form is readily interpreted as a prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Church, and there is, as Lagrange

17 *καὶ πυρί· οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ διακαθᾶραι τὴν
ἅλωνα αὐτοῦ καὶ συναγαγεῖν τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην*
18 *αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ. Πολλὰ
μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν·*
19 *ὁ δὲ Ἡρῴδης ὁ τετραάρχης, ἐλεγχόμενος ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ περὶ
Ἡρῳδιάδος τῆς γυναικὸς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ*
20 *πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν πονηρῶν ὁ Ἡρῴδης, προσέθηκεν*

argues (against Dibelius, *Die vorchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*), no impossibility in supposing that John did foretell a baptism by 'the mightier one' with Spirit. In Is. xi. 2 the future Davidic king is endowed with the spirit of the Lord (and this passage had not been overlooked, *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 42; En. xlix. 3, lxii. 2), while Joel iii. 1-5 speaks of the effusion of the Spirit in the day of the Lord. But the combination of 'fire' and 'the spirit' is not easy. Luke himself may not improbably have interpreted both of Pentecost (cf. Acts ii. 3), but the 'fire' in John's mouth will mean the fire of the judgement day as suggested by the next verse. Note, however, that there the fire is purely destructive. For 'baptism by fire' the thought of fire as a testing as well as a destructive force seems required, as in 1 Cor. iii. 13 ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστι τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει. Cf. Is. i. 25, iv. 4; Zech. xiii. 9; Mal. iii. 2, 3. On the whole it seems likely that the introduction of the Holy Spirit in this connexion is a Christian gloss and that an earlier form of the tradition spoke only of 'baptism by fire.' (So Wellh., Harnack.)

17. πτύον] The winnowing shovel with which the farmer throws the grain against the wind to separate it from the chaff.

διακαθᾶραι τὴν ἅλωνα] Cf. Alciphr. *Ep.* ii. 23 (iii. 26) ἄρτι μοί τὴν ἅλω διακαθήραντι καὶ τὸ πτύον ἀποτιθεμένῳ. Mt. καὶ διακαθαριεῖ . . . καὶ συνάξει. The infinitives διακαθᾶραι . . . καὶ συναγαγεῖν will be Lucan stylistic improvements. διακαθαίρειν is used by class. writers, διακαθαρίζειν is late Greek only. For the aorist form ἐκάθαρα (class. ἐκάθηρα) cf. 1 Cor. v. 7 ἐκκαθάρατε; *B.C.H.* xxvii. (1903) p. $73^{79}$ διακαθάραντι.

ἀσβέστῳ] The adj. is prob. introd. into the parable, where it is not strictly relevant, by reminiscence of the 'unquenchable fire' of Gehenna. Is. lxvi. 24; Mk. ix. 43 f.

18. εὐηγγελίζετο] John's teaching had culminated in a prophecy of the coming of the Christ and can therefore be regarded by Luke as 'good news.' The noun εὐαγγέλιον does not occur in the Gospel, but the verb is frequent in the Lucan writings.

19. τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ] Erroneously named Philip in Mk. vi. 17. Herod Philip, tetrarch of Ituraea, married not Herodias but her daughter Salome. Luke's omission of the mistaken name is probably deliberate.

20. προσέθηκεν] This use of προστίθημι with a direct obj. and ἐπί c. dat. followed directly by a verb in the indic. explaining the object is quite distinct in meaning from the Hebraising use of the verb with an infin. (=יסף) frequent in the LXX and found in xx. 11, 12 and Acts xii. 3. "He added this

*καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, κατέκλεισεν τὸν Ἰωάνην ἐν φυλακῇ.*

to all his other evil deeds, viz. he shut up . . ." *κατέκλεισεν*] At Machaerus, a fortress near the Dead Sea, Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 2.

### THE BAPTISM OF JESUS (iii. 21, 22)

Luke reverts to the public ministry of John to recount his baptism of Jesus.

An account of the baptism seems to have been contained in Q as well as in Mark. Slight agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark (Mt. *ἠνεῴχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί*, Lk. *ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν*, Mk. *σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς*; Mt., Lk. *ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν*, Mk. *εἰς αὐτόν*) are not in themselves decisive, but an account of the baptism seems required to connect Q's account of the ministry of John with the subsequent narrative of the temptation of Jesus.

Ed. Meyer (i. p. 83) holds that authentic information with regard to the life of Jesus starts with the public ministry in Galilee; the narrative of the temptation he regards as 'mythical,' and he doubts the historicity of the baptism of Jesus by John. But there are other passages in the Gospels which testify to the decisive importance of John's mission in the eyes of his successor: Lk. vii. 24 f. = Mt. xi. 7 f.; Mk. xi. 30 = Mt. xxi. 25; Lk. xx. 4 ("The Baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men?"). Of the latter passage Meyer says that it is 'certainly authentic.' If so, it seems unlikely that Jesus had not himself been baptized by John. And if he was baptized, it is *a priori* probable that his baptism was a crisis in his life and was connected with the call to his mission.

It is a further question how the narratives in the Gospels stand related to the original circumstances. Comparative study of the Gospels reveals a tendency to transform the event into a public attestation of Jesus as the Christ. In Mark we read that 'Jesus saw the heavens rent,' and the voice from heaven addresses Jesus alone. Luke's account is not essentially different, though the opening of the heavens is stated directly as an event, and an additional touch (*σωματικῷ εἴδει*) emphasises the external reality of the appearance of the Spirit. But in Matthew the divine utterance is changed from the second person into the third and thus seems to be addressed to the bystanders rather than to Jesus. The fourth Evangelist omits the actual baptism and gives only the Baptist's testimony to the abiding of the Spirit upon his greater successor. The Marcan account is clearly the most primitive. If it rests on authentic information, it must be derived from Jesus himself.

But as Origen pointed out (*Contra Celsum* i. 48, quoted by Meyer i. p. 84), Scripture does not say that Jesus himself reported the opening of the heavens and the descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove, and this supposed περιαυτολογία is not, Origen maintains, in harmony with the character of him who said κἂν ἐγὼ εἴπω περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής. If, with Origen and E. Meyer, we regard it as improbable that the narratives depend on a communication of Jesus, we must take them to represent pictures which believers formed of the beginning of his mission as Son of God. Such a hypothesis does not involve the conclusion that the pictures were creations of the pure imagination, for (1) there is reason to believe that historically the evangelists are right in connecting the beginning of the Gospel with the baptism of John, and (2) the estimate of the person of Jesus, which the narratives reflect, had its origin in the impression which he made upon his followers both before and after his death.

For Jesus, as for others, John's baptism will mark the beginning of a new life, but "the antithesis to an earlier state of sinfulness need not be pressed" (Klostermann on Mt. iii. 14). Jesus left with his disciples an impression that he was 'without sin,' and his recorded teaching does not suggest the converted penitent. If the baptism of God's messenger brought him a unique conviction that he was son of God, it is congruous to suppose that the antecedent conditions had also been unique. That Jesus should have submitted to a 'baptism of repentance' was early felt to be a difficulty. Matthew seeks to remove the objection by the dialogue between Jesus and John (iii. 14, 15), and for another—and far weaker—apologetic explanation see *Ev. sec. Hebr. apud* Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* iii. 2 *Ecce mater Domini et fratres eius dicebant ei : Joannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum : eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis : Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo ? Nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est.* Luke, too, was probably conscious of a difficulty. See note on *v.* 21.

Neither Mark nor Q contained birth narratives, and the place and importance of the baptism and of the heavenly voice in these narratives fit in with the belief that it was at the baptism that Jesus became Son of God. A similar form of belief perhaps underlies the Johannine writings (cf. Reinhold Seeberg ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, *Festgabe A. von Harnack*, 1921, pp. 263 f.), and is reflected in the history of the Epiphany festival (cf. Usener, *Das Weihnachtsfest*, pp. 18 f.). The preceding birth narratives in Matthew and Luke rob the baptism of some of the significance which it carried in Mk. and Q. It is noteworthy that in the primitive Christological formulation reproduced in Ignat. *Eph.* xviii. 2, *Smyrn.* i. 1, the baptism still has its place alongside the birth, while in the Old Roman Creed the birth has displaced the baptism. Cf. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (2nd ed.), pp. 264 f.

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ 21
Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν
οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει 22
ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι

21. ἐν τῷ c. infin. of time—a Hebraism. Blass, § 71. 7; Moulton, p. 249. βαπτισθῆναι] The aor. retains its force as in ii. 27, "when all the people had been baptized." Cf. Introduction, p. lxxix.

καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου] The conjunction of the gen. absol. with the preceding clause is very awkward. Luke may have been conscious of difficulties in the baptizing of Jesus by John, and for this reason throws the baptism itself into a subordinate participial clause, reserving the infins. dep. on the main vb. ἐγένετο to recount the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven. The aor. part. βαπτισθέντος contrasted with the present part. προσευχομένου makes the descent of the Spirit coincident with the prayer of Jesus, not with his baptism, which has already been completed. The same motive is perhaps at work here which led the fourth Ev. to omit the actual baptism. Luke emphasises the place of prayer in the life of Jesus, v. 16, vi. 12, ix. 18, 28, 29, xi. 1, and (with Mk. and Mt.) xxii. 41. ἀνεῳχθῆναι] ἀνοιχθῆναι D. For the double augment see Blass, § 15. 7.

22. τὸ ἅγιον] A Lucan addition. σωματικῷ εἴδει] A Lucan addition, which shews that the Ev. understood Mark, prob. correctly, to compare the visible manifestation of the Spirit, as well as his manner of descent, to that of a dove. The dove was a type of gentleness, cf. Mt. x. 16. Rabbinic lit. often compares Israel to a dove. In the Talmud (Chagiga 15 a) Ben Zoma, a younger contemporary of the Apostles, is quoted as comparing the 'brooding' of the Spirit in Gen. i. 2 to the brooding of a dove (Tosefta Chag. ii. 5 gives 'eagle' with reference to Dt. xxxii. 11). A late Targum on Cant. ii. 12 interprets the turtle-dove of the Holy Spirit. In Bab. Talm. *Berachoth* 3a a heavenly voice *Bath-Qol* is heard moaning as a dove. This would help to explain the comparison here, but "in the older rabbinic literature there is no passage in which the dove is clearly a symbol of the Holy Ghost," S.B. i. p. 125 (see also Abrahams, *Studies*, 1st Ser. p. 47). Compare, however, Philo, *Quis rer. div. her.* 127 (on Gen. xv. 9) ἡ θεία σοφία . . . συμβολικῶς . . . τρυγὼν καλεῖται . . . περιστερᾷ ταύτην (i.e. τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην σοφίαν) ἀπεικάζουσι.

καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι κτλ.] A voice from heaven proclaims to Jesus that he is son of God. (Cf. the voice at the Transfiguration, ix. 35.) The best attested version of the words agrees with Mk., but D lat.vt (but not *e* and apparently not Cyprian—see Burkitt, *J.Th.S.* xxvi. p. 291), Justin Clem. Al. give the words of Ps. ii. 7 υἱός μου εἶ σύ· σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

22 συ ει . . . ευδοκησα] υιος μου ει συ εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε D a b al codd.ap. Aug Justin Clem Meth Juvenc Ambst Tycon

Harnack and Streeter argue that this is the original reading, which was afterwards felt to be open to doctrinal objection, and therefore assimilated to the reading of [Mt. and] Mk.; also that it was probably derived by Lk. from Q. On the other hand, the reading of D may well be due to assimilation to the text of the Psalm. Justin, who knew the other Gospels, clearly welcomes a text which agrees with the words of the O.T. (*Dial.* 88). Also, if the ordinary reading is due to assimilation, assimilation to Mt. (οὗτός ἐστι) rather than to Mk. (σὺ εἶ) might have been expected. But the reading in Mt. iii. 17 is uncertain. D a syr.vt Iren.pap. Oxyrrh give σὺ εἶ. (See Burkitt, *Ev. d. Meph.* ad loc.) There is no consciousness on the part of Justin or of Clement or of Methodius or of Augustine that the reading might be heretical in tendency. That the words of the Psalm were currently applied to Christ in the Apostolic Church is seen from Heb. i. 5 (where they seemed to refer to the pre-existent Christ) and Acts xiii. 33 (where they are referred to the resurrection, cf. Rom. i. 4). The Marcan version of the words at the baptism is reminiscent of O.T. language and thought (cf. LXX Hab. ii. 4; Is. lxii. 4; Ps. cxlix. 4, cli. 5 οὐκ εὐδόκησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς Κύριος of David's brothers), but appears not to be quotation. The closest parallel is the version of Is. xlii. 1 in Mt. xii. 18 (which differs from LXX) ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου. ὁ ἀγαπητός in the Heavenly Voice may bear the well-attested meaning of 'only,' 'unique,' in which case it will be constructed with ὁ υἱός μου 'my only son' (C. H. Turner, *J.Th.S.* xxvii. pp. 113 ff.). Or it may be a distinct title 'the beloved' used to designate the Messiah, cf. Eph. i. 9; Ep. Barn. iii. 6, iv. 3, 8 (Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 229). So the Old Syriac version 'My Son and My Beloved.'

## The Genealogy of Jesus Christ (iii. 23-38)

The baptism of Jesus by John marked the beginning of the work of Jesus, and the evangelist feels this to be a suitable place at which to introduce a genealogy shewing the descent of Jesus, through David and Abraham, from the father of the human race.

That Jesus was of Davidic descent is asserted by St. Paul (Rom. i. 3), assumed in St. Mark (x. 48), and implied in the Acts (ii. 30) by St. Peter. It is probable that this genealogy and the independent and incompatible genealogy in Mt. i. were both constructed in Jewish Christian circles to substantiate the Davidic descent. Matthew traces the descent through the direct royal line, and Luke by a side line through David's son Nathan (2 Sam. v. 14; 1 Chron.

iii. 5, xiv. 4). The two lists coincide again at the names of Zerubbabel, the founder of the second Temple, and his father Salathiel, and then again part company until they reach Mary's husband Joseph. The construction of the Lucan genealogy may have been influenced by the curse of Jeremiah (xxii. 28, 30, xxxvi. 30-31) on Jehoiakim and his son Jehoiachin, the latter of whom appears in Matthew (as in 1 Chron. iii. 17) as father of Salathiel, while the reference to the family of Nathan in Zech. xii. 12 perhaps suggested a line of descent through that son of David.

The genealogy as we have it depends upon the LXX, for the name of Καινάμ (om. D) as father of Sala and son of Arphaxad (*v.* 36) is found in the LXX, but is absent from the Hebrew of Gen. x. 24.

Matthew traces the descent of Jesus from Abraham only. Possibly Luke is himself responsible for extending his genealogy to Adam. In any case it is in harmony with the spirit of his Gospel to bring out the relationship of Jesus to the whole human family in virtue of his descent from the first man, who was son of God.

In both Gospels the descent is traced through Joseph, not through Mary, and it may be safely inferred that the circles in which the genealogies originated regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph. ὡς ἐνομίζετο will be an addition to cover a discrepancy with the circumstances of the conception as they had been related in *c.* i.

The discrepancies between the genealogies in Matthew and Luke were from early times a source of difficulty. From a letter of Julius Africanus (*c.* A.D. 220) to a certain Aristides (*fragm. apud* Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii. pp. 228 f.) we learn that some accounted for the differences by the theory that the genealogies were symbolic—that of Matthew representing Christ's royal character, and that of Luke his priesthood. Africanus himself (*apud* Eus. *H.E.* i. 7) argued that in virtue of the law of Levirate marriage (Deut. xxv. 5 f.) a man might be spoken of as son either of his actual father or of his mother's first husband. Thus Joseph was really the son of Eli, but by law the son of Eli's brother Jacob. But Jacob and Eli were uterine brothers only, Jacob's father being descended from David through Solomon, and Eli's father being descended from David through Nathan. "Although we can urge no testimony in its support," says Africanus, "we have nothing better or truer to offer. In any case the Gospel states the truth." The theory advocated by Annius of Viterbo (*c.* A.D. 1490) that Luke gives the genealogy of Mary can be traced back to the fifth century (see Lagrange, *ad loc.*), but its support in patristic interpretation is slender.

23 Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὢν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ

τοῦ Ἡλεί
24 τοῦ Ματθάτ
τοῦ Λευεί
τοῦ Μελχεί
τοῦ Ἰανναί
τοῦ Ἰωσήφ
25 τοῦ Ματταθίου
τοῦ Ἀμώς
τοῦ Ναούμ
τοῦ Ἐσλεί
τοῦ Ναγγαί
26 τοῦ Μαάθ
τοῦ Ματταθίου
τοῦ Σεμεείν
τοῦ Ἰωσήχ
τοῦ Ἰωδά
27 τοῦ Ἰωανάν
τοῦ Ῥησά
τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ
τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ
τοῦ Νηρεί
28 τοῦ Μελχεί
τοῦ Ἀδδεί
τοῦ Κωσάμ
τοῦ Ἐλμαδάμ
τοῦ Ἤρ
29 τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
τοῦ Ἐλιέζερ
τοῦ Ἰωρείμ
τοῦ Μαθθάτ
τοῦ Λευεί
30 τοῦ Συμεών
τοῦ Ἰούδα
τοῦ Ἰωσήφ
τοῦ Ἰωνάμ
τοῦ Ἐλιακείμ
31 τοῦ Μελεά
τοῦ Μεννά
τοῦ Ματταθά
τοῦ Ναθάμ
τοῦ Δαυείδ
32 τοῦ Ἰεσσαί
τοῦ Ἰωβήλ
τοῦ Βοός
τοῦ Σαλά
τοῦ Ναασσών

23 αρχομενος om e f syr.sin : ερχομενος Clem Iren    του Ηλει . . . του Ναθαμ (*v.* 31)] nomina e Matt i. 6-16 : του Ιακωβ . . . του Σολομων substit. D additis V regum nominibus quae praeterm. Matt    32 Σαλα ℵ*B syr.sin ; Σαλμων A D syr.cur (cf. Matt i. 4, 1 Chron ii. 11)

23. ἀρχόμενος] This word seems to have caused difficulty in early times. Hence prob. its omission in Old Latin texts and Old Syriac, and the variant reading ἐρχόμενος 'when he came to the baptism.' But the word has point in emphasising that this was 'the beginning' (cf. Acts i. 22, x. 37), and helps to justify the insertion of the genealogy at this stage.

ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα] The Ev. gives a round number which does not give much help in elucidating the apparently conflicting chronological data in i. 5, ii. 2, and iii. 1.

33 τοῦ Ἀδμείν
τοῦ Ἀρνεί
τοῦ Ἑσρών
τοῦ Φαρές
τοῦ Ἰούδα
34 τοῦ Ἰακώβ
τοῦ Ἰσαάκ
τοῦ Ἀβραάμ
τοῦ Θαρά
τοῦ Ναχώρ
35 τοῦ Σερούχ
τοῦ Ῥαγαύ
τοῦ Φάλεκ
τοῦ Ἔβερ
τοῦ Σαλά
36 τοῦ Καινάμ
τοῦ Ἀρφαξάδ
τοῦ Σήμ
τοῦ Νῶε
τοῦ Λάμεχ
37 τοῦ Μαθουσαλά
τοῦ Ἑνώχ
τοῦ Ἰάρετ
τοῦ Μαλελεήλ
τοῦ Καινάμ
38 τοῦ Ἐνώς
τοῦ Σήθ
τοῦ Ἀδάμ
τοῦ θεοῦ.

33 του Αδμειν του Αρνει B: mult inter se diff MSS et verss: του Αδαμ praem. ℵ*: του Αμιναδαβ του Αραμ AD latt syr.vg ϛ ex Matt i. 4 (cf. Ruth iv. 19 sqq 1 Chron ii. 10) vide WH *App* p. 57 et de txt syr.sin Burkitt *Ev. da Meph.* ad loc 36 του Καιναμ om D

## The Temptation in the Desert (iv. 1-13)

From the Jordan Jesus withdraws to the desert, where, after a forty days' fast, he encounters the devil, who tempts him to put his powers as son of God to the test and to transfer his allegiance to himself.

That a period of retirement and of spiritual struggle should have succeeded the experiences of the baptism is in itself intelligible. It is a further question whether our accounts of the temptation in the desert depend on the testimony of the only person who could have given first-hand testimony. As in the case of the baptism, our answer will partly depend on our view of the probability of such autobiographical communications on the part of Jesus, partly also on the character of the narratives themselves.

The narrative of the temptation in Luke as in Matthew is dependent upon Mark and upon another common source, probably Q. Mark and the non-Marcan source differ somewhat in their presentation: Mark's very brief narrative does not refer to the fast, and probably implies that Jesus was fed by angels during the forty days; moreover the temptation is represented as taking place during the forty days. This last conception reappears in Luke, where it does not entirely harmonise with the rest of the narrative derived from the non-Marcan source, which regards a forty days' fast as the preliminary to the *first* temptation.

It seems likely that the picture as given in Q has been filled in by the imagination of the early Church. The balanced structure of the three temptations with the three quotations of Scripture in reply suggests a reflective dramatisation of the rejection by Jesus of false Messianic ideals. Magical feats ascribed to Simon Magus and others parallel to the first and third temptations are referred to in the notes. The Gospel narrative is not improbably designed to distinguish the claims and character of Jesus Christ from those of such false Christs and false prophets. Perhaps also the narrative reflects a reaction against crude belief in miracle within the Church. Cf. Eitrem, *Die Versuchung Christi* (*Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift*, 1924); Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 54.

That Jesus was tempted is a central thought in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Otherwise it does not appear in the N.T. outside the synoptic Gospels. The fourth Evangelist omits this element of the tradition from his account of the incarnate life of the Logos.

IV 1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ
2 τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἡμέρας
τεσσεράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. Καὶ οὐκ
ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν
3 αὐτῶν ἐπείνασεν. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ
4 θεοῦ, εἰπὲ τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ ἵνα γένηται ἄρτος. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη

1 ἁγίου om boh$^{\text{codd}}$ Ath.

1. πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου] A characteristic Lucan addition, which determines the interpretation of ἐν τῷ πνεύματι in the next sentence as equivalent to ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος, *v.* 14. So Wellh. In Mk., on the other hand, and in Mt. the Spirit is an outward force which acts upon Jesus. τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον Mk.; ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος Mt.

2. ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα] A round figure, as frequently in O.T., e.g. 1 Ki. xix. 8, of Elijah's journey to Horeb. οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν] Stronger than Mt. νηστεύσας.

συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν] An idiomatic improvement. Mt. ὕστερον.

3. εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ] The temptations are consequent upon the proclamation of the sonship at the baptism. The devil tempts him to use supernatural power to satisfy his own wants. Jesus adduces the words of Deut. viii. 3: man's needs are not physical only. Mt. completes the quotation ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ. Changing stones into bread was one of the feats of Simon Magus, Pseudo-Clem. *Hom.* ii. 32.

πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Γέγραπται ὅτι Οὐκ ἐπ᾽ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ
ζήϲεται ὁ ἄνθρωποϲ. Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ 5
πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου· καὶ 6
εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος Σοὶ δώσω τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην
ἅπασαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται καὶ ᾧ ἂν
θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν· σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, 7
ἔσται σοῦ πᾶσα. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ 8
Γέγραπται Κύριον τὸν θεόν ϲου προϲκυνήϲειϲ καὶ αὐτῷ
μόνῳ λατρεύϲειϲ. Ἤγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ 9
ἔστησεν ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] Εἰ
υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω· γέγραπται γὰρ 10
ὅτι τοῖϲ ἀγγέλοιϲ αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ ϲοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι ϲε,
καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦϲίν ϲε μή ποτε προϲκόψῃϲ πρὸϲ λίθον 11

5. Matthew places this temptation last, probably preserving the original sequence. The temptation to win the world by worshipping the devil should be the climax. This time Jesus is bidden, not to test, but to surrender the divine sonship. The motive of Luke's change of order may have been the desire to avoid a second change of scene. ἀναγαγὼν αὐτόν] By omitting 'the very lofty mountain' which is given as the scene of the temptation in Mt. (and prob. in Q), and by inserting the phrase ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου Lk. softens the realism and conveys the impression of a visionary experience.

6. καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν must refer back to τὰς βασιλείας. But the sentence would be much eased if the words could be either omitted or placed, as in Mt., after τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης (τοῦ κόσμου Mt.). αὐτήν v. 6 and πᾶσα v. 7 would then refer simply to τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην. ὅτι ἐμοὶ . . . αὐτήν] An explanatory clause peculiar to Lk. The devil is *de facto* ruler of this world, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, as in John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11. Cf. Bousset, *R.J.*$^3$ pp. 514 f. Instead of displacing him, Jesus is tempted to receive dominion at his hands. The scriptural reply is quoted from Deut. vi. 13.

9 f. On this occasion the devil himself quotes Scripture. The son of God can surely rely on the supernatural aid promised in Ps. xci. to those who trust God. The temptation and its rejection should be set against the background of stories of flights through the air ascribed to wonder-workers. Cf. *Vercelli Acts of Peter*, xxxii. (of Simon Magus); Lucian, *Philopseudes* 40; Maspéro, *Contes populaires*, pp. 143, 199 n. 1. Such display is not compatible with the character and mission of Jesus Christ.

9. τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ] The exact site referred to here (and in Hegesippus *ap.* Eus. *H.E.* ii. 23. 11) is uncertain. πτερύγιον ('little wing') probably means 'pinnacle' or 'battlement.' Cf. Lat. *pinna.* Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 11. 5, refers to the dizzy height of the στοὰ βασίλειος on the south side of the Temple area.

12 τὸν πόδα σου. *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι*
13 *Εἴρηται* Οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου. *Καὶ συντελέσας*
*πάντα πειρασμὸν ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ.*

12. Jesus quotes Deut. vi. 16.

13. *συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμόν*] Editorial. Mt. *τότε*. *ἄχρι καιροῦ*] Add. Luc. It is implied that the temptations were resumed. Cf. xxii. 28; also Mk. viii. 33 (= Mt. xvi. 23) where Satan speaks through Peter. But Mk. viii. 33 is omitted in Lk.

## The Ministry in Galilee (iv. 14–ix. 50)

The scene of this section of the Gospel is laid in Galilee. It opens with the return of Jesus to Galilee, and except at viii. 26 when Jesus and his disciples sail across the lake to the country of the Gerasenes, "which is opposite to Galilee," Luke leaves it to be inferred that the work of Jesus continued to be carried on in the cities and villages of Galilee. An indication that the scene is to be changed is found at ix. 31, where we are told that Moses and Elijah spoke of his ἔξοδος which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. The Galilean section ends at ix. 50, after which Jesus "set his face to go up to Jerusalem."

The narrative reproduces Mk. i. 14–ix. 39 with some limitations, of which the following are the more important:

(1) vi. 20–viii. 4 is all derived from non-Marcan sources.

(2) The Marcan narratives of the call of the disciples (i. 16-20) and of the visit to Nazareth (vi. 1-6) are replaced by longer and variant versions of the same events in different connexions (v. 1-11, iv. 16-30). But in each case the influence of the Marcan version may still be traced.

(3) Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 is omitted. See Introd. pp. lix f. One consequence of this omission is that the journey of Jesus to the parts of Tyre and Sidon drops out. This, combined with the omission of mention of "the villages of Caesarea Philippi" at ix. 18 (= Mk. viii. 27) leaves in Luke an impression of an uninterrupted Galilean ministry, until the last journey to Jerusalem.

14 *Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος*
*εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου*
15 *περὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς*
*αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων.*

14, 15. Jesus returns to Galilee and wins fame as a teacher. An editorial summary. The first public appearance of Jesus is not, as in Mk. and Mt., directly related to the arrest of John, which has been already recorded (iii. 19 f.). Mt. dates the public teaching of Jesus from his first arrival in Capernaum after leaving Nazareth: in Lk. he is already famous as a teacher before his visit to Nazareth.

### THE PREACHING OF JESUS AT NAZARETH AND HIS REJECTION (iv. 16-30)

After a period of successful teaching in Galilee, Jesus comes to Nazareth, his native city. His preaching in the synagogue impresses his hearers, who however are later provoked and turn upon him. Jesus escapes from their fury and leaves the city.

Mark does not mention a visit to Nazareth until a later period and he assigns the rejection of Jesus by his fellow-townsmen to that occasion (vi. 1-6). Mt. follows Mk. in his account of the rejection, but he also implies a visit to Nazareth before the opening of the ministry at Capernaum (iv. 13 *καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά*). In view of the mention of Nazareth in the first chapters both of Mt. and Lk., it is not remarkable that the two evangelists should agree in referring to Nazareth again at this point. There is nothing except the name to suggest a common source, but it is remarkable that they should agree in giving here the rare form *Ναζαρά* (so B k al in Mt., but ℵD al *Ναζαρέθ*).

Most critics agree with Augustine that this narrative and Mk. vi. 1 f. deal with the same event. Lagrange, who accepts the identification and also holds that Mt. and Lk. are to be followed in giving a visit to Nazareth at an earlier date, suggests that Lk. has conflated records of two visits, and that this accounts for the obscurity which is to be noted in the sequence of the narrative. Even so difficulties remain, and it is easier to suppose that Lk. has taken the narrative of Mk. vi. (which he omits at the corresponding point in his own Gospel, viii. 56) as foundation for a representative and symbolic scene to open the public ministry of Jesus, and that he himself is mainly responsible for the section as it stands. The essential features of Mk. vi. 1 f. are reproduced. Jesus preaches in the synagogue and impresses his hearers, who however take offence at the 'wisdom' of their fellow-townsman. Jesus retorts with the saying that a prophet is not without honour except among his own people. The failure to work miracles recorded in Mk. is not repeated directly in Lk., but it is presupposed—somewhat awkwardly—in the complaint which Jesus ascribes to his hearers, *v.* 23. But the Marcan narrative is expanded in two directions. (1) Lk. makes the recorded fact of the sermon an opportunity of announcing the programme of the Gospel. Jesus declares himself to be the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy of one anointed with the spirit, who is to relieve the poor and afflicted and to proclaim 'the acceptable year of the Lord.' This is, in effect, a substitute for the Marcan summary of the preaching of Jesus (Mk. i. 15) which Lk.

has omitted, probably because he felt that it failed to express more important aspects of the Gospel. (2) Jesus is represented as appealing to the precedents of Elijah and Elisha who worked miracles for aliens rather than for their own countrymen, to explain why his own miracles performed at Capernaum had not been repeated at Nazareth. The story thus transformed is lacking in sequence: there is no proper transition from the people's wonder at the 'gracious words' of Jesus (*v.* 22) to the complaint which Jesus ascribes to them in *v.* 23. Moreover the incidents cited from the careers of Elijah and Elisha provide good precedents for a mission to Gentiles—and this no doubt was their real significance to the evangelist—but the implied analogy between the inhabitants of Capernaum and the heathen widow of Sarepta and Naaman is too remote to be original.

The narrative must not be pressed. Its real function is to introduce the main *motifs* which are to recur throughout the Gospel and the Acts, and this it does with great effect: the Gospel to the poor is preached by Jesus in his own home and rejected. The rejection by Nazareth foreshadows the rejection by the Jewish people and the subsequent universal mission of the Church.

16 Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρά, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν
κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν
17 συναγωγήν, καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι. καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ
βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἠσαίου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν
[τὸν] τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον

18 Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ,

16. ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι] Neither the reading of Scripture nor the preaching (cf. Acts xiii. 15) is restricted to officials. The reader stands to read and sits to preach, *v.* 19. The prophetic lection (Haphtare) has no doubt been preceded by the lection of the law (Parasche); cf. Acts xiii. 15, xv. 21. On the authorities for the customs of the synagogue cf. Schürer, ii. pp. 527 f. "How far the account is based on adequate knowledge of the Jewish custom it is hard to judge: it must not at once be assumed that the later rabbinic standard is applicable" (Wellh.). Lk., however, may probably himself be taken as a good authority for Jewish custom, at least in the Diaspora.

17. εὗρεν τὸν τόπον] It is implied that there was no fixed order of prophetical lessons. Cf. Schürer, ii. p. 533.

18. Πνεῦμα Κυρίου κτλ.] Is. lxi. 1 f. The application of this passage of prophecy to the gospel of Jesus is also presupposed in vii. 22 = Matt. xi. 5 (Q) τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται. God had 'anointed' (ἔχρισεν) Jesus

οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς,
ἀπέσταλκέν με κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν,
ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,
κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν Κυρίου δεκτόν. 19

*καὶ πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισεν· καὶ* 20
*πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ.*
*ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι Σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ* 21
*γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν. καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν* 22
*αὐτῷ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς*
*ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον Οὐχὶ*
*υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος; καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Πάντως* 23

with the spirit at his baptism. Cf. Acts x. 38 *ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει*, where the wording again recalls Is. lxi. The text here follows the LXX with the following variations: post *ἀπέσταλκέν με* Lk. om. *ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν*; *ἀποστεῖλαι τοὺς τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει* add. ex Is. lviii. 6; *κηρύξαι*: *καλέσαι* LXX. Jesus fulfils the prophecy of good news for the poor and redemption for the afflicted. By putting this prophecy in the forefront, Lk. strikes a somewhat different note from Mk., who begins with the imminence of the kingdom, and the call to repentance.

20. *πτύξας*] The book was in the form of a roll. Nothing is said of the usual translation of the Hebrew Scripture into the Aramaic of common speech.

*τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ*] For the חַזָּן and his functions cf. Schürer, ii. p. 515, who quotes an inscription of the Roman Jewish community *Φλάβιος Ἰουλιανὸς ὑπηρέτης. Φλαβία Ἰουλιάνη θυγάτηρ πατρί. ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἡ κοίμησίς σου.*

*πάντων . . . ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ*] For the omission of the art. cf. Blass § 479.

21. *ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν*] c. *πεπλήρωται*, i.e. in hearing my words, you hear the fulfilment of the prophecy. Wellh. and Klost. wish to construct *ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν* with *ἡ γραφὴ αὐτή* 'this scripture which you have just heard.' But this is harsh and is not demanded to make sense.

22. *ἐμαρτύρουν*] Lit. 'bore witness to him,' i.e. praised him. Cf. Acts xxii. 12.

*τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος*] 'Gracious words,' cf. Col. iv. 6 *ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος. χάρις* does not here mean 'the divine grace' as in Acts xx. 24 *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ.*

*οὐχὶ υἱός . . . οὗτος;*] The question need not express more than surprise, and is so interpreted by Wellh., who holds that the change to hostility first follows at *v.* 28. The parallel questions in Mk. relating to the family of Jesus (vi. 3) lead up to the statement *καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ*. This is softened in Lk., but here too we are probably meant to discover an undertone of indignation to which Jesus replies in the following verses. In any case a very awkward transition is involved.

23-27. "Jésus, dans Marc, peut bien dire, en se voyant mal reçu à

ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην Ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον
σεαυτόν· ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναοὺμ
24 ποίησον καὶ ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου. εἶπεν δέ Ἀμὴν λέγω
ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.
25 ἐπ' ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλαὶ χῆραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς
ἡμέραις Ἠλείου ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔτη
τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν
26 γῆν, καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμφθη Ἠλείας εἰ μὴ εἰϲ

Nazareth, qu'un prophète n'est pas honoré dans son pays ; ce n'est pas motif pour que le prophète, avant toute manifestation d'hostilité, se refuse à faire le miracle qu'on pourra lui demander en preuve de sa mission ; il n'y a pas non plus de rapport entre le cas du prophète dédaigné chez lui et les examples d'Élie et d'Élisée, Élie n'ayant pas été précisément honoré à Sarepta, et Élisée n'ayant jamais été méprisé en Israel. L'artifice est sensible dans la suture rédactionnelle" (Loisy).

23. πάντως] A strong affirmative.

ἐρεῖτε] Wellh. most improbably regards this future as prophetic of a future rejection at Nazareth (as in Mk. vi.) consequent upon future successes at Capernaum. The successes at Capernaum have, it is true, not yet been related, but they might be held to be covered by the activity related in *vv.* 14, 15 *supra*. In any case the whole must have been meant to refer to the present occasion.

ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν] A proverbial saying common in the ancient world, e.g. Eur. Fragm. 1071 (Nauck) ἄλλων ἰατρὸς αὐτὸς ἕλκεσιν βρύων. Bereshith Rabba 23 "Physician, heal thine own limp." Cf. Wettstein, *ad loc.* It does not seem to be very appropriate here, for the demand is that the physician should heal, not himself, but his neighbours. A variant of the saying occurs in *Oxyrrh. Logia* vi. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς· οὔκ ἐστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[ο]ῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γεινώσκοντας αὐτόν. Bultmann, *G.S.T.* p. 15 follows Wendling and Preuschen (*Z.N.T.W.* xvii., 1916, pp. 33-48) in holding that this saying underlies the narrative of Mk. vi. 1 f. as well as this passage in Luke. It is far more probable that the *Oxyrrh. Logion* depends upon Lk., for though less effective as a proverb, the form of the saying in the *Oxyrrh. Logia* suits the occasion of this narrative better than the form which is here actually used. The application in Lk. has in this case reacted upon the proverb.

24. ἀμήν] Six times only in Lk., who usually translates the foreign word into Greek. Cf. ἐπ' ἀληθείας in the next verse.

25. ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ] So also in James v. 7, though 3 Regn. xviii. 1 does not extend the famine beyond three years. Plummer and Klost. suggest that the 3½ years of disaster in Apocalyptic (Dan. vii. 25; Rev. xii. 14) have influenced the reckoning.

λιμὸς μέγας] τὴν λιμὸν Δωριεῖς, σὺ δὲ ἀρσενικῶς τὸν λιμὸν φάθι. Phryn. clxiv. Fem. in xv. 14, and Acts xi. 28.

26. εἰ μή] Adversative, not exceptive in force. Cf. Rev. xxi. 27. It is not necessary to assume Aramaic

Σάρεπτα τῆς Σιδωνίας πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν. *καὶ πολλοὶ λεπροὶ* 27
*ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς*
*αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη, εἰ μὴ Ναιμὰν ὁ Σύρος. καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν* 28
*πάντες θυμοῦ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα, καὶ ἀνα-* 29
*στάντες ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν*
*ἕως ὀφρύος τοῦ ὄρους ἐφ᾽ οὗ ἡ πόλις ᾠκοδόμητο αὐτῶν, ὥστε*
*κατακρημνίσαι αὐτόν· αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν* 30
*ἐπορεύετο.*

idiom (so Wellh.). Cf. *O.G.I.S.* 201. 20 and Dittenberger *ad loc.*; Aristoph. *Eq.* 186; *Lysistr.* 943; *Thesm.* 898, for Greek parallels.

*γυναῖκα χήραν*] Wellh. holds that the sense requires mention of the heathen extraction of the woman to contrast with the *πολλαὶ χῆραι ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ*, and that *χήραν* is due to misreading an Aramaic orig. ארמיא as ארמלא, thus proving an Aramaic documentary source for *vv.* 25-27. But *χήραν* reproduces the LXX of 3 Regn. xvii. 9 *γυναικὶ χήρᾳ*, and the reference to Sarepta points sufficiently the required contrast.

29. *ἕως ὀφρύος . . . ᾠκοδόμητο αὐτῶν*] Nazareth lies on the slope of a hill. The site here referred to has been much disputed. Cf. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 49. Probably it is a mistake to attempt topographical verification.

30. A miraculous disappearance is probably implied as in Jo. viii. 59. Loisy reads too much artifice into the narrative when he suggests that the author is thinking mainly of the final issue of Christ's gospel: "The Christ escapes in the glory of his immortality from the death which the Jews wished to inflict upon him, and the faith of Christ, rejected and persecuted by the same Jews, makes its way among the nations." Yet the triumphant mission of Jesus, in spite of the hostility of enemies and the narrow enthusiasm of friends (*v.* 42), is no doubt felt by the evangelist to be a fitting prelude to the story which is to follow in Acts.

## SUCCESSES AT CAPERNAUM AND A WIDER MISSION (iv. 31-44)

Luke now begins to follow closely the Marcan narrative.

Marcion began his Gospel at this point, combining iii. 1 with iv. 31, and transferring the preceding section, iv. 16-30, to follow *v.* 39. *κατῆλθεν* then means 'came down from heaven.'

*Καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας.* 31

31-37. Jesus teaches in a synagogue at Capernaum where he is recognised and acclaimed by a demoniac as 'the Holy one of God.' To the astonishment of the onlookers Jesus casts out the demon from the possessed man. || Mk. i. 21–28. Lk. reproduces and slightly abbreviates Mk. with alterations which are mainly verbal only. The power exercised by Jesus over the possessed clearly made a deep im-

32 *Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν· καὶ ἐξεπλήσ-*
*σοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.*
33 *καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου*
34 *ἀκαθάρτου, καὶ ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ*
*σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ,*
35 *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων*
*Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ῥίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ*
*δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν*

pression upon his associates, and is deeply embedded in the tradition. Cf. Acts x. 38 ὃς *διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.* Only in St. John do we find no cures of demoniacs. That the demons, in virtue of their supernatural knowledge, recognised the true character of Jesus is a standing feature of the Marcan picture (i. 23, 34; iii. 11; v. 7) which reappears in Lk.

31. *πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας*] Lk. adds the geographical description of Capernaum, the chief centre of the Galilean ministry, for the benefit of his Gentile readers.

32. Lk. omits Mk.'s contrast with the scribes who lacked 'authority.' Reitzenstein (*Poimandres*, p. 48, n. 3) interprets *ἐξουσία* here in a quasi-magical sense—power based on knowledge of divine secrets; cf. *Pap. mag. Mus. Lugd. Batav.*, ed. Dieterich, *Jahrbücher f. Class. Phil. Supplem.* xvi. p. 802. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*,³ pp. 302, 363, but the meaning of *ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ* here is quite general, 'with authority.' So Mt., who makes Mk.'s words a conclusion to the proclamation of the new Law in the Sermon on the Mount.

34. *ἔα*] An interjection (not derived from *ἐάω*) expressing indignant surprise. Here only in N.T.; frequent in Attic poets, but rare in prose, as in Plato, *Protag.* 314 D. *ἔα* in Job iv. 19 (?), xv. 16, xix. 5, xxv. 6 (LXX) is a different word, being used as a conjunction to trans. אַף כִּי, with the meaning 'much less,' 'let alone,' and is prob. derived from *ἐάω*.

*τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί;*] The meaning is 'what have we in common with thee?' Cf. Judg. xi. 12; 3 Regn. xvii. 18; 4 Regn. iii. 13; Epict. *Diss.* i. 1. 16 *τίς ἄνεμος πνεῖ;* 'Βορέας,' *τί ἡμῖν καὶ αὐτῷ; ib.* i. 27. 13. *ἡμῖν . . . ἡμᾶς*] i.e. us devils.

*ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*] Besides this passage and the Marcan original, this phrase occurs only in Jo. vi. 69. Cf. Acts iv. 27; 1 Jo. ii. 20; Rev. iii. 7. In Ps. cv. (cvi.) 16 Aaron is spoken of as *ὁ ἅγιος Κυρίου.* To a Christian reader 'the consecrated of God' would suggest the Christ.

35. *φιμώθητι*] Lit. 'be muzzled.' *φιμοῦν* had acquired the special meaning of 'to bind with a spell.' Cf. Cypriote spells publ. in *Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Archaeol.* xiii. (1890) pp. 174 ff.; Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. p. 424. But here the word prob. means only 'to be silenced,' as prob. in Mk. iv. 39 and certainly in Mt. xxii. 12, 34; 1 Peter ii. 15; Jos. *B.J.* prooem. 5, and elsewhere.

*ῥίψαν . . . εἰς τὸ μέσον*] For the Marcan *σπαράξαν. μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν*] A Lucan addition which heightens the wonder. In *v.* 33 *supra* Lk. had

*αὐτόν. καὶ ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ συνελάλουν* 36
*πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ*
*καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν, καὶ*
*ἐξέρχονται; Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο ἦχος περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα* 37
*τόπον τῆς περιχώρου. Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς* 38
*συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος. πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ*
*Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ, καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν*
*περὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ* 39
*πυρετῷ, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν· παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει*

added *φωνῇ μεγάλῃ* to *ἀνέκραξεν*. Here he omits the Marcan *καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*. By this transposition of the great cry Lk. leaves the devil obedient and silent, after the word of command has been uttered.

36. *ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας*] Mk. *ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες*. Lk.'s periphrasis is characteristic; cf. v. 9, 26.

*τίς ὁ λογος οὗτος;*] 'What is this teaching?' Mk. *τί ἐστι τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινή*.

37. *ἦχος*] Mk. *ἡ ἀκοή*—a word which does not appear in Lk. in the sense of 'report.' For *ἦχος* cf. xxi. 25; Acts ii. 2; Heb. xii. 19.

38. In Mk. the account of the call of Simon, Andrew, James and John is placed at the beginning of the ministry. Lk. has omitted this section in order to replace it with his own version of the call of Peter which follows at v. 1. This transposition leaves the introduction of Simon's name at this verse (taken over from Mk.), and the visit of Jesus to his house, abrupt and unexplained. The names of the other disciples, Andrew, Simon's brother, and James and John, which occur in Mk., are dropped.

*ἀναστὰς δὲ . . . εἰσῆλθεν*] sc. *Ἰησοῦς*—a very natural modification of the Marcan plural *ἐξελθόντες . . . ἦλθον* which here and elsewhere may conceivably originate, as C. H. Turner acutely suggests, in a first person plural used by Peter himself. *J.Th.S.* xxvi. p. 226.

*ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*] Mk. *κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα. συνέχεσθαι* of disease is common in Greek writers, but not found in Mk. *πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ* is well illustrated by Galen, *De diff. febr.* i. 1 (vol. vii. p. 275 ed. Kühn) *καὶ σύνηθες ἤδη τοῖς ἰατροῖς ὀνομάζειν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ γένει τῆς διαφορᾶς τὸν μέγαν τε καὶ μικρὸν πυρετόν*. See Introduction, p. xx.

*ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν*] It is not clear who are to be taken for the subject of the verb. In Mk. we have the less precise *λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς*, where *λέγουσι* is probably to be understood as an impersonal plural 'he is told.' See Turner, *J.Th.S.* xxv. p. 378.

39. *ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς*] Mk. *προσελθών. ἐπιστῆναι* is very frequent in Lk.

*ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ*] Lk. personifies the fever. Mk. *ἤγειρεν αὐτήν*. Lk. omits the detail *κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς*.

*παραχρῆμα*] Inserted by Lk. to emphasise the miraculous nature of the cure. The word occurs in Mt. xxi. 19, 20. Otherwise it is confined in N.T. to Lk.

40 αὐτοῖς. Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι
εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς
αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθε-
41 ράπευεν αὐτούς. ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν,
κράζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐπι-
τιμῶν οὐκ εἴα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν
42 εἶναι. Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς
ἔρημον τόπον· καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπεζήτουν αὐτόν, καὶ ἦλθον
ἕως αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι ἀπ'
43 αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι Καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις
πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ,
44 ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην. Καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς

40, 41. At sunset Jesus performs many cures and casts out devils who acclaim him as Son of God. Jesus suppresses their testimony to his person. || Mk. i. 32-34. The most important modifications are (i.) the words *καὶ ἡ πόλις συνηγμένη ἦν πρὸς τὴν θύραν* are omitted, thus obscuring the Marcan account, which implies that the healings took place outside the house of Simon and Andrew; (ii.) Lk. adds the detail that Jesus healed by laying his hands upon the sick; (iii.) he draws on Mk. iii. 11 for the actual testimony of the demoniacs, which he inserts here and omits at vi. 18.

41. *τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι*] Add. Luc.

42-44. A wider mission is undertaken in spite of enthusiastic crowds who would have kept Jesus to themselves. || Mk. i. 35-39. But Lk. has given a slightly different tendency to the paragraph: in spite of his emphasis elsewhere upon the praying of Jesus (cf. iii. 21 n.) he has here suppressed the Marcan statement that Jesus had retired to pray. The omission here may be due to Luke's desire to emphasise the single point of the extended mission. Compensation is made at v. 16. In Mk. it is the disciples who seek out Jesus with the words 'all are looking for thee': in Lk. the disciples are not mentioned; it is the multitude who seek for him and try to prevent his departure (add. Luc. *κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν*).

43. *καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις . . . τοῦ θεοῦ*] A characteristic Lucan paraphrase; cf. viii. 1. Mk. *Ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω.*

*ἀπεστάλην*] Lk. interprets Mk. *ἐξῆλθον* in the sense 'came out on my mission'—probably rightly.

44. *κηρύσσων εἰς*] So Mk. *εἰς* = *ἐν* (which Mt. substitutes iv. 23). "The classical position, namely, that *ἐν* with the Dative answers the question 'where?' *εἰς* with the Accus. the question 'whither?' had from early times been simplified in some dialects by *ἐν* taking to itself both cases and both functions; but the popular Hellenistic language went in the other direction and reduced everything to *εἰς* with Accus. representing 'where?' and 'whither?' From this intermixture, which meets us also in the LXX and in Egyptian

*συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας.*

44 *της* Ιουδαιας ℵBCL 1 etc. 157 syrr(sin.hl)aegg: *της* Γαλιλαιας AD mult al latt syrr(vg.hl-mg) boh(codd)arm ϛ

private records, no *writer of narrative* in the N.T. is free, with the exception of Matthew," Blass, § 39, p. 122.

*τῆς Ἰουδαίας*] The best attested reading. Mk. *εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.* Lk. uses *Ἰουδαία* for Palestine, cf. i. 5, vi. 17, vii. 17, xxiii. 5; Acts x. 37; but also in the narrower sense, i. 65, ii. 4, iii. 1, v. 17, xxi. 21.

## The Call of Peter and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (v. 1-11)

Luke here interpolates into the Marcan narrative a substitute for the account of the call of the first disciples, which he has omitted from the beginning of Mark. Like the non-Marcan narrative of the visit to Nazareth, this passage has a symbolic value. There the rejection by the Jews, here the winning of the Gentiles, is in some sense prefigured. Peter, the leader of the apostolic band, is called by Christ to become a fisher of men, and the success which is to attend his future mission is foreshadowed in the miraculous draught of fishes which he secures under the direction of Jesus.

The account of the miracle is closely parallel to the narrative in Jo. xxi. The principal features are the same in each story: the disciples toil all night and take nothing; then, at the bidding of Jesus, the net is lowered, and a large haul is secured. That there is some relationship, either direct or collateral, between the two narratives can scarcely be doubted. Wellh. holds (i.) that the story is a Lucan creation, the miracle being suggested by the saying which is already found in Mk. that the fishermen disciples are to become fishers of men, and (ii.) that the Johannine story depends directly upon Luke. In some particulars, it is true, the Johannine narrative appears to be more developed than the Lucan: the unbroken net and the 153 fish are consciously given a symbolic meaning in Jo. in a manner that is not paralleled in Lk. On the other hand, the Johannine version gives a more natural and, presumably, a more original setting. The disciples are at sea, after a long night's fruitless labour, when the stranger on shore bids them drop the net on the right side of the boat; they do not, like Peter in Lk., deliberately put out to sea to catch the miraculous draught. We may also observe a difficulty in the Lucan narrative which would be well explained if the story derives from an account of a post-resurrection appearance of Christ to Peter parallel to that in Jo. xxi.: the exclamation of Peter, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," seems inadequately explained by his 'wonder' at the haul of fishes; but if the words originally belonged to an account of the first appearance of the Risen Lord to Peter, they are wholly in place: Peter recognises the Master he has denied, and begs him to leave his sinful disciple. Harnack thinks it probable that Lk. derived the story from the supposed lost end of Mk., and that the same tradition is represented in Jo. xxi., and probably also in the lost conclusion of the Gospel of Peter (*Luke the Physician*, p. 227 n.).

In any case this narrative as it stands in Lk. shews signs of having been compiled from more than one source: the preaching to the multitude out of the ship is borrowed from Mk. iv. 1 (it is omitted at the corresponding place in Lk. viii. 4), and leaves an awkward transition to the sudden command to Peter to launch out into the deep. The abrupt introduction of James and John in *v.* 10, which reads like an afterthought, is probably due to Luke's combination of Mk. i. 16-20 with another narrative in which Peter was the central figure.

V. 1 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκούειν
τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἑστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην
2 Γεννησαρέτ, καὶ εἶδεν πλοῖα δύο ἑστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην,
οἱ δὲ ἁλεεῖς ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες ἔπλυνον τὰ δίκτυα.
3 ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων, ὃ ἦν Σίμωνος, ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν
ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπαναγαγεῖν ὀλίγον, καθίσας δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου
4 ἐδίδασκεν τοὺς ὄχλους. ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν, εἶπεν πρὸς
τὸν Σίμωνα Ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ
5 δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς Σίμων εἶπεν Ἐπι-
στάτα, δι᾽ ὅλης νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν, ἐπὶ δὲ
6 τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες

1. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν . . . καὶ εἶδεν] On this and other constructions with ἐγένετο see i. 8 n. καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἑστώς is probably parenthetical. So D ἑστῶτος αὐτοῦ.

λίμνην] Cf. viii. 22, 23, 33. Lk. substitutes the correct geographical term for θάλασσα used in Mk. and the other Gospels. A return to Capernaum where Peter lived is implied but not stated.

3. ὀλίγον] D ὅσον ὅσον—a popular expression, which is possibly original. Cf. Heb. x. 37 and Is. xxvi. 20 (LXX).

4. ἐπανάγαγε . . . χαλάσατε] Simon alone directs the ship, but he needs help to let down the nets.

5. ἐπιστάτα] 'Master.' Confined to Lk. in N.T. Except in xvii. 13 used only by disciples. Lk. avoids Ῥαββεί, so frequent in the other Gospels, as he avoids other non-Greek words.

συνέκλεισαν πλῆθος ἰχθύων πολύ, διερήσσετο δὲ τὰ δίκτυα
αὐτῶν. καὶ κατένευσαν τοῖς μετόχοις ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ 7
τοῦ ἐλθόντας συλλαβέσθαι αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἦλθαν, καὶ ἔπλησαν
ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά. ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων 8
Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ λέγων Ἔξελθε ἀπ᾽
ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε· θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν 9
αὐτὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων
ὧν συνέλαβον, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάνην υἱοὺς 10
Ζεβεδαίου, οἳ ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν
Σίμωνα Ἰησοῦς Μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ

10 11 *ομοιως δε και . . . ηκολουθησαν αυτω*] *ησαν δε κοινωνοι αυτου Ιακωβος και Ιωανης υιοι Ζεβεδαιου ο δε ειπεν αυτοις Δευτε και μη γεινεσθε αλιεις ιχθυων ποιησω γαρ υμας αλιεις ανθρωπων οι δε ακουσαντες παντα κατελειψαν επι της γης και ηκολουθησαν αυτω* D e (sed pro *ο δε . . . γεινεσθε* habet e qui ait ad Simonem Ihs Nolite esse)

7. *ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ*] i.e. the second of the two boats mentioned in *v.* 2. The *μέτοχοι*, as appears from *v.* 10, are James and John. A close parallel is quoted by Wettstein from Alciphron, i. 20 (17) 2 *πεισθέντες τῇ σαγήνῃ μονονουχὶ τὸν κόλπον ὅλον περιεβάλομεν. εἶτα ἀνιμώμεθα, καὶ τὸ βάρος μεῖζον ἦν ἢ κατὰ φορτίον ἰχθύων. εὐέλπιδες οὖν καὶ τῶν πλησίον τινὰς ἐκαλοῦμεν μερίτας ἀποφανεῖν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, εἰ συλλάβοιντο ἡμῖν καὶ συμπονήσαιεν.*

Attempts have been made to interpret the details as symbolic: the *μέτοχοι* represent Barnabas and Paul, who help Peter in converting the heathen. But this reads more into the text than Luke intended.

8. *Σίμων Πέτρος*] Simon's surname is given in vi. 14. The two names are combined in Lk. here only. Syr.sin lat.vt (codd) om. *Πέτρος*.

*κύριε*] The address need not mean more than 'sir,' cf. Jo. xx. 15; but here the word must carry its full force of 'Lord.' It expresses a feeling of awe, not suggested by *ἐπιστάτα supra v.* 5.

9. *θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτόν*] A characteristic periphrasis. Cf. iv. 36.

*καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ*] i.e. the others in Peter's boat, as distinguished from the *μέτοχοι* in the second boat.

10. In Mk. i. 17 f. Jesus addresses the call *Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλεεῖς ἀνθρώπων* to Simon and his brother Andrew, and then a little later finds and calls James and John. In Lk. Andrew, whose name appears only in the list of the twelve, is left out and the commission to be a fisher of men is addressed to Peter alone. James and John, who are to play an important part in the later history, are included by name as 'associates of Simon.' In Mark they appear as a separate group with their father Zebedee. D assimilates the words of Jesus to the text of Mt. and Mk. and addresses them to the three disciples.

*μὴ φοβοῦ*] The Divine Lord reassures his awestruck follower.

*ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*] A favourite expression with Lk. Cf. i. 48, xii. 52, 11 *ζωγρῶν. καὶ καταγαγόντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.*

xxii. 18, xxii. 69; Ac. xviii. 6. Also [Jo.] viii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 16.

11. ἀφέντες πάντα] All is renounced. Cf. *v.* 28 (the call of Levi) where a similar phrase καταλιπὼν πάντα is inserted by Lk.

### v. 12–vi. 11

Luke rejoins Mark, and reproduces, without substantial change, narratives of (1) the healing of a leper, (2) the healing of a paralytic, (3) the call of Levi, with (4) a consequent controversy with Pharisees on fasting, and (5) two controversies with Pharisees concerning the observance of the Sabbath day.

The narratives of the controversies of Jesus with the Pharisees form a group of stories, which possibly existed as a group before their incorporation into Mark's Gospel. The early Palestinian community, it may be conjectured, under pressure of controversy with Pharisaic critics, felt the impulse to embody in simple literary form the living memory of controversies in which Jesus had vindicated his own and his disciples' freedom against Pharisaic critics. A collection of such narratives may have been made at some later date, and at a yet later period the collection may be supposed to have provided Mark with materials for his account of the ministry of Jesus. For an interesting conjectural attempt to reconstruct the literary development of the tradition cf. Albertz, *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche*, pp. 57 f.

12 *Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας· ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πεσὼν ἐπὶ*

12-16. The Marcan narrative (i. 40-45) has no close connexion either with the section which precedes or with that which follows. Probably it had an independent history before its incorporation in Mk. It is likely that such a story would be valued and preserved in some sections of the early community as an example of the compliance of Jesus with the ceremonial law. This same interest is perhaps responsible for the position of the story in Mt. immediately after the Sermon on the Mount. The difficulties of the Marcan narrative are well discussed in Rawlinson, pp. 20 f., 265.

12. Mk. begins abruptly καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρός. Lk. gives a characteristic Biblical colouring to the style, καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνήρ (ἰδού is never used in narrative by Mark; frequent in LXX, Mt. and Lk.) and introduces the narrative by the phrase ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. The words ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων (add. Luc.) give a connexion with iv. 43. ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας] Mk. λεπρός. πλήρης is frequently used in Gk. medical writers of disease, but no exact parallel to πλήρης λέπρας is quoted. Hobart, p. 5. πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον] Mk. γονυπετῶν, not Lucan. ἐδεήθη] Found Mt. ix. 38 (= Lk. x. 2). Otherwise

πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί
με καθαρίσαι. καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων 13
Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.
καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν 14
δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ
σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωυσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. δι-
ήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι 15
πολλοὶ ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶν·
αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσευχόμενος. 16

14 *εις μαρτυριον αυτοις* e f g$^{1.2}$ vg: *ινα εις μαρτυριον η* (D* *ην*) *υμειν τουτο* D a b c ff$^2$ Marcion Tert Amb. add praeterea D *ο δε εξελθων ηρξατο κηρυσσειν και διαφημειζειν τον λογον ωστε μηκετι δυνασθαι αυτον φανερως εις πολιν εισελθειν αλλα εξω ην εν ερημοις τοποις και συνηρχοντο προς αυτον και ηλθεν παλιν εις Καφαρναουμ* scil ex Marc i. 45

peculiar in N.T. to Luke and Paul. LXX and Classical Gk.

*Κύριε*] Mt. and Lk. agree against Mk. (W.H. Text) in reading *Κύριε*. But it is not certain that *Κύριε* should not be read in Mk. too with BCLWΘ 579 700 sah c e ff$^2$. Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 309.

13. If Mt. and Lk. read *ὀργισθείς* in Mk. i. 41 (D a ff$^2$ Ephr) it would be natural that they should omit it, as they omit *v.* 43. If they read the well-attested *σπλαγχνισθείς* the omission is surprising. Lk. omits *καὶ ἐκαθερίσθη*—no doubt as redundant. Mk. continues (*v.* 43) *καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθέως ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν*. The difficulties of modern commentators (cf. Rawlinson, p. 256) in accounting for the behaviour of Jesus were probably felt by Mt. and Lk., who both omit the words.

14. Lk. reproduces the words of Jesus from Mk. almost exactly, except that he turns the first clause (Mk. *ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς*) into indirect speech, replaces *ὕπαγε* by the partic. *ἀπελθών*, transposing *δεῖξον* and *σεαυτόν*, and reads *καθώς* for *ἅ*.

The Mosaic Law prescribing the offerings for a cleansed leper are in Lev. xiv. 1 f. A similar instruction is given to the ten lepers, xvii. 12 f., *q.v.* *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*] 'as a public testimony.' *αὐτοῖς* means 'people in general,' not 'the priests.' Note the singular *τῷ ἱερεῖ* 'the officiating priest.' But *αὐτοῖς* might without great difficulty be understood of 'the priests,' and the reading *ὑμῖν*, which appears to have been adopted by Marcion, was perhaps intended to rule out that interpretation; with the reading *ὑμῖν* the phrase might mean 'that this miracle may serve as a testimony to you of my power.' "Peut-être Marcion craignait-il que Jésus ne parût se soumettre au contrôle des prêtres" (Lagrange).

15. Lk. omits to mention the disobedience of the healed leper, and omits to say that the result of the fame of Jesus was that he could no longer enter into a city. He records the spread of the report about Jesus, and describes the motives which brought the crowds after him.

16. *ὑποχωρῶν*] A good classical word. Only here and ix. 10 in N.T. *καὶ προσευχόμενος*] An addition which balances an omission in iv. 42.

17 *Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων, καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι οἳ ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ· καὶ δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν.*
18 *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος, καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ θεῖναι [αὐτὸν]*

18 *θειναι*] add *αυτον* BLΞ : sine addit ℵD codd paene omn

17 f. ( || Mk. ii. 1-12; Mt. ix. 1-8.) On this occasion Jesus makes his power of healing subordinate to his power to forgive sins; the reality of the latter power is attested by the reality of the former. Did Jesus hold that disease was punishment for sin? It is impossible to feel sure that the incident and the words of Jesus have been exactly recorded. The theory of Wrede, Loisy, Bultmann that Mk. ii. 5b-10 are a later expansion due to the theological interest of the early community, and that the account of the healing of the paralytic existed originally without reference to the forgiveness of his sins, is stated and defended by Rawlinson on Mk. ii. 1-12. The main difficulty lies in the words ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *v.* 10. If this implies a claim to be the Son of Man who was expected on the clouds of heaven, Jesus cannot have thus spoken of himself in public. But other explanations of this problem are possible. See *v.* 24 n. The literary argument for regarding Mk. ii. 5b-10 as originally foreign to the context is hardly convincing. The anacoluthon in *vv.* 10, 11 is in keeping with Mark's style (cf. C. H. Turner, *J.Th.S.* xxvi. pp. 145 f.). The only other passage in the Gospels where Jesus is related to forgive sins is *infra* vii. 48, and it is to be noted that there, as here, the forgiveness is put in a declaratory form: 'thy sins are forgiven,' i.e. by God, *not* 'I forgive thee' (cf. Montefiore, *S.G.* i. pp. 46 f.).

17. The introd. to the narrative is wholly rewritten. Note the characteristic *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καί* . . . and cf. *v.* 12 *supra.* In Mk. the presence of *γραμματεῖς* is not noted till a later point in the story. Besides transposing the statement, Lk. adds that they had come from all Palestine and Jerusalem. In Mk. scribes from Jerusalem are first mentioned at iii. 22. This is in a section of Mk. (on 'casting out devils by Beelzebub') which does not appear in the corresponding place in Lk., and is replaced (xi. 14 f.) by a parallel from Q. *νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, an equivalent of *γραμματεῖς* (*v.* 21), occurs besides in N.T. only Ac. v. 34; 1 Tim. i. 7. *Ἰουδαία* here has the restricted meaning 'Judaea.'

18. *καὶ ἰδού*] Cf. *v.* 12 *supra*, n.

*ἄνδρες*] four in number, acc. to Mk.

*ἐπὶ κλίνης . . . σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ*] Lucan substitutes for the vulgar *κράβαττος* of Mk.; cf. Phryn. xliv. *σκίμπους λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ κράββατος*, and Rutherford *ad loc.* But *κράβαττος* occurs Ac. v. 15, ix. 33. Also Jo. v. 8 f.; Epict. i. 24. 14.

*παραλελυμένος*] The usual Greek word substituted here and *v.* 24 for *παραλυτικός* Mk. (very rare and no doubt vulgar; also in Mt.).

*ἐζήτουν . . . ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*] Add. Luc. For *ἐνώπιον* cf. i. 15 n.

ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτὸν 19
διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα διὰ τῶν κεράμων
καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔμπροσθεν
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπεν Ἄνθρωπε, 20
ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου. καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι 21
οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες Τίς ἐστιν οὗτος
ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται ἁμαρτίας ἀφεῖναι εἰ
μὴ μόνος ὁ θεός; ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς 22
αὐτῶν ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς 23
καρδίαις ὑμῶν; τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν Ἀφέωνταί σοι
αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν Ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει; ἵνα δὲ 24
εἰδῆτε ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

19. *ποίας*] sc. *ὁδοῦ*. Local gen., cf. xix. 4 *ἐκείνης* (*εκεινη* D) *ἤμελλεν διέρχεσθαι*. "Incorrect, since the gen. in class. Greek denotes the whole area within which something goes on" (Blass § 36. 13; cf. Moulton, *Prol.* p. 73).

*ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα*] Implied, but not directly stated, in Mk.

*διὰ τῶν κεράμων καθῆκαν*] Mk. *ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην . . . καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι.* Wellh. finds a contradiction in Mark between *ἀπεστέγασαν* 'unroofed' and *ἐξορύξαντες* 'breaking through,' and suggests that the former is due to mistranslation of an Aramaic original which meant 'they brought him up to the roof.' But the supposed contradiction does not seem serious enough to justify the conjecture. The Palestinian house had a flat roof covered with earth and an outside staircase (cf. Mk. xiii. 15 and parallels, Acts x. 9), and with this Mark's description seems to agree. Luke pictures a roof of tiles, but this will be merely his own interpretation. The use of tiled roofs seems not to be attested for Palestine (cf. Vincent, *Canaan*, p. 70; Thomsen, *Kompend. d. Pal. Altertumskunde*, § 15, and Klostermann *ad loc.*).

It may be noted that syr.sin leaves out *διὰ τῶν κεράμων*.

20. *ἄνθρωπε*] Mk. gives the more affectionate address *τέκνον*.

21. *τίς ἔστιν . . . βλασφημίας;*] An iambic verse.

24. *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*] The evangelists and their readers would naturally understand this phrase here, as elsewhere, to mean Jesus, and to imply the claim that he is the Son of Man of Dan. vii., who is to come with the clouds of heaven. The meaning of the sentence, then, is that Jesus as the divine Son of Man represents God and can forgive sins. But an open claim of this character during the ministry in Galilee is not easy to reconcile with the general presentation of the ministry in the synoptic Gospels. On this ground some critics argue that the whole of this section in which Jesus claims to remit the paralytic's sins is a later growth which has been created under the influence of dogmatic belief. But 'son of man' in Aramaic, as in Hebrew, means simply 'man.' It *may* connote an allusion to Dan. vii.,

*ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας— εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ Σοὶ λέγω,*
*ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιόν σου πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν*
25 *σου. καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἄρας ἐφ' ὃ*
*κατέκειτο, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν.*
26 Καὶ *ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν,*
*καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι* Εἴδαμεν *παράδοξα*
*σήμερον.*

27 Καὶ *μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην ὀνόματι*

---

27 *και μετα ταυτα . . . Λευειν] και ελθων παλιν παρα την θαλασσαν τον επακολουθουντα αυτω οχλον εδιδασκεν και παραγων ειδεν Λευει τον του* Αλφαιου D cf. Marc ii. 13

but it need not. Hence here and *infra* vi. 5 ( = Mk. ii. 28) some critics favour the interpretation of 'son of man' as 'man' used generically. (So Wellh., cf. *Einleitung*, p. 129.) "A man may have this authority, impossible as you think it to be." This interpretation is perhaps supported by Mt. (ix. 8), who closes his narrative with the words ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. But this is hardly decisive. Son of Man as used of Jesus in Mt. approximates to some extent to the later dogmatic use to signify the *humanity* of Jesus (Ign. *Eph.* xx.). Cf. Smith on Mt. ix. 8. This prepares for his modification of Mk. in the last sentence. He hardly means that men in general have, or may have, authority to forgive sins, but rather that Jesus, who is man invested with divine authority, has this power, and men (possibly the Church) through him. The idea that man as man has, or may have, authority to forgive sins appears to be out of harmony with the spirit both of Judaism and of early Christianity, and this passage is a precarious foundation on which to build the doctrine. It is impossible to reconstruct with security the words that Jesus used. Nathan pronounced absolution upon David (2 Sam. xii. 13). A similar prophetic absolution on the part of Jesus would be likely to arouse the antagonism of the Scribes, and this may lie at the foundation of this narrative of controversy, which, as it stands, is a later literary growth.

*ἄρας*] Part. for *ἆρον καὶ* . . . Mk. *πορεύου*] Very common in Lk. (once only in Mk.—ix. 30), Mk. *ὕπαγε*.

25. *παραχρῆμα*] Mk. *εὐθύς*, cf. iv. 39 n. *δοξάζων τὸν θεόν*] The gratitude of the healed man is peculiar to Lk.

26. *καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας*] Mk. *ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας*. For Lk.'s periphrasis cf. iv. 36 n. *καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου*] Add. Luc. Except Mt. xxii. 10, xxvii. 48 (where it is used literally) *πίμπλημι* is confined to Lk. in N.T. Frequent both in Gosp. and Ac., cf. i. 15, 41, 67, iv. 28, vi. 11: Ac. ii. 4, iii. 10, iv. 8, 31, v. 17, ix. 17, xiii. 9, 45.

*παράδοξα*] Good Greek; Plato, Josephus, Lucian, etc., LXX. Here only in N.T.

27-39. *The call of Levi: a feast in his house: controversies with Scribes and Pharisees.* || Mk. ii. 13-22; Mt. ix. 9-17. In Lk. these passages form a connected whole. The material is taken over from Mk., and his order is, as usual, retained.

Λευεὶν καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀκολούθει
μοι. καὶ καταλιπὼν πάντα ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ. 28
Καὶ ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην Λευεὶς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ· 29
καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων οἳ ἦσαν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν
κατακείμενοι. καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς 30
αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγοντες Διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν
τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε; καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς 31

But it is doubtful whether the Marcan order goes behind the evangelist, and doubtful whether Mark himself intended to connect the feast with the call of Levi, or the controversies of Mk. ii. 18-22 (=Lk. v. 33-39) with the feast. See notes on *vv.* 29, 33, 36.

27. μετὰ ταῦτα gives the true force of πάλιν Mk., cf. Wellh. on Mk. ii. 13. Lk. omits Mk.'s statements that he was by the sea, that he was followed by multitudes, and that he taught them. See above, *v.* 1, for an equivalent.

καὶ ἐθεάσατο] Mk. καὶ παράγων εἶδε. παράγω never occurs in Lk. nor θεάομαι in Mk.

τελώνην ὀνόματι] Add. Luc. The name of Levi's father (τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου Mk.) is omitted.

28. καταλιπὼν πάντα] Add. Luc., cf. *v.* 11 *supra*. Levi illustrates the practice of complete renunciation; cf. xiv. 33 οὕτως οὖν πᾶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ὃς οὐκ ἀποτάσσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής (peculiar to Lk.).

ἀναστάς] The position after καταλιπὼν πάντα is awkward. Possibly intruded from Mt. or Mk.; om. syr.sin.

29. Mk. καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, where it is not certain that αὐτοῦ does not mean Jesus. So apparently Mt., who omits αὐτοῦ. Lk.'s paraphrase leaves no doubt that he understood Levi to have been the host, thus making a historical link between the two consecutive sections of his source.

30. ἐγόγγυζον] According to Phryn. cccvi. an Ionic word, which, though not ἀδόκιμον, is best avoided. γογγύζειν, γογγυσμός fairly frequent in N.T., but not in Mk. Occurs Epict., LXX, and papyri.

οἱ Φαρ. καὶ οἱ γραμμ. αὐτῶν] 'the Pharisees and the Scribes of their party.' Mk. οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων. It is implied that a scribe was not necessarily (though he probably was usually) of the Pharisaic party; cf. Acts xxiii. 9 τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων.

διὰ τί] So Mt. and Lk. for the interrogative ὅτι in Mk. In Mark the scribes ask the disciples why *Jesus* eats with publicans and sinners; Lk. makes the complaint refer to the conduct of the disciples (ἐσθίετε). καὶ πίνετε] Add. Luc.

Jesus' habit of consorting with disreputable persons is strongly attested, as well as the offence which he thus occasioned. Cf. *infra* vii. 34 (=Mt. xi. 19) Q. Montefiore and Abrahams (*Studies*, 1st ser. pp. 54 f.) urge that the synagogue was always ready to welcome repentant sinners, but they allow that the behaviour of Jesus in seeking out sinners implies a new attitude which would not accord with Pharisaic sentiment. Bultmann (*G.S.T.* p. 8) holds that the saying in *v.* 31 (=Mk. ii. 17) originally existed in isolation, and that the scene was created to give it a set-

[ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ὑγιαί-
32 νοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλὰ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι
33 δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν. Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς
αὐτόν Οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάνου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις
ποιοῦνται, ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν
34 καὶ πίνουσιν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Μὴ δύνασθε
τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν
35 ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι; ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ
ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς

31 ο Ιησους om ο B 33 εσθιουσιν και πινουσιν] ουδεν τουτων ποιουσιν D e

ting. But why may not an incident as well as a saying have been recalled and recorded? The presence of scribes at such a feast, he urges, is impossible. It does not seem probable. Perhaps the complaint was actually made elsewhere when Jesus had left the feast. Mk.'s account is not strictly inconsistent with this, though ἰδόντες (*v.* 16) certainly suggests that he thought of them as present at the feast.

31. οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες] The participle recurs vii. 10, xv. 27. Mk. οἱ ἰσχύοντες.

32. καλέσαι] 'to bid.' This would gain in point if, in the original form, Jesus was understood himself to be the host. δικαίους] Ironical. εἰς μετάνοιαν] A Lucan addition, which gives a more conventional tone to the saying. For a similar addition cf. viii. 12 and Mk. iv. 15.

33. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν] i.e. the scribes and Pharisees mentioned above in *v.* 30, in spite of the awkward οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων *infra*. The awkwardness is explained by reference to the Marcan source, which reads: καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάνου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Διὰ τί . . . Here the statement καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ κτλ. introduces a fresh section, while the verbs ἔρχονται and λέγουσι are best explained as impersonal plurals: 'the question is asked.' This Marcan idiom (cf. *J.Th.S.*, 1924, xxv. pp. 378 f.) is missed both by Mt. and Lk.: Mt. represents the complainants as disciples of John, while Lk. represents them as Pharisees.

πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται] Add. Luc., cf. xi. 11 n. ἐσθίουσι καὶ πίνουσι] For Mk. οὐ νηστεύουσι. There is no contrast to δεήσεις ποιοῦνται. Hence the correction in D e.

34. μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος . . . ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι ;] For Mk. μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος . . . νηστεύειν ;

35. By transposing καί from before τότε to before ὅταν Lk. destroys the rhythmic parallelism of the Marcan saying. The words read as an anticipation of the Passion. Wellh. thinks that the whole incident has originated in an attempt to justify the Church for taking over a custom of fasting from the disciples of John, which Jesus himself had notoriously not observed. J. Weiss thinks that the reply of *v.* 34 may be authentic, and the words of *v.* 35 a later embellishment. Rawlinson (on Mk. ii. 18 f.) suggests that the disciples of John were holding an

ἡμέραις. Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι 36
Οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ
ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ τῷ
παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ.
καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μήγε, 37
ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ 38
οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς
βλητέον. [Οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ 39
Ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν.]

39 *ουδεις . . . χρηστος εστιν* om D lat.vet (exc. f g$^{1.2}$ q) Eus. *χρηστος* pap$^4$ ℵBLW 157 225 aegg syr.vg arm: *χρηστοτερος* rell ϛ. *παλαιον*] add *ευθεως* codd pler ϛ : om ℵBLC* 1 etc 157

especial fast in memory of their executed master, but the mention of the Pharisees coupled with the disciples of John confirms the impression that it is the ordinary practice of fasting which is here under discussion. For fasting as a practice of the early Church see Acts xiii. 2, 3, xiv. 23, and *Did.* viii. Cf. also Mt. vi. 16 f., xvii. 21.

36-38. Two proverbial sayings which illustrate the inability of old tradition to contain new life.

36. ἔλεγεν δὲ . . . πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι] sc. τοὺς Φαρισαίους *v.* 30, cf. *v.* 33. But the sentence is an editorial insertion by Lk.

ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας . . . τὸ καινὸν σχίσει] This altogether improbable proceeding of cutting up a new garment to patch an old one is only contemplated in Lk. It is due to editorial change, and is certainly not an improvement. In Mk. (and Mt.) the saying only concerns the fate of an old garment when patched with undressed cloth. ἐπιβάλλει] So also Mt., for ἐπιράπτει Mk.

εἰ δὲ μήγε] The verb in protasis suppressed. 'If he does not avoid this blunder . . .' 'Otherwise.' A classical use. Also in papyri. See Moulton-Milligan, s.v. γε. Cf. x. 6, xiii. 9, xiv. 32. Mk. εἰ δὲ μή, and so B 301 in Mt., where other MSS. give εἰ δὲ μήγε as here.

37. ἐκχυθήσεται] In Mk. the verb ἀπόλλυται is used both of wine and skins; both Mt. and Lk. have introduced the verb ἐκχεῖσθαι of the wine. ἐκχεῖται Mt. Skin bottles are still in common use in N. Africa and in the East. See also Hom. *Il.* iii. 247; Gen. xxi. 14 f.; Job xxxii. 19.

38. βλητέον] 'one must put.' The gerundive in -τέος here only in N.T. "It is not unknown in the papyri, but can hardly have belonged to the genuine popular speech." Moulton, *Prol.* p. 222.

39. This saying is not found in Mk., and as it is omitted here by D lat.vt it may not be original in Lk. Harnack thinks that it is original in Lk. and that its omission in D lat.vt is due to the influence of Marcion's text (*Marcion*$^2$, p. 247*). Its interpolation at this point, whether it is to be ascribed, as is perhaps most probable, to the evang. himself or to an early copyist, will have been suggested by the mention of new wine in *v.* 38. The saying well illustrates the attitude of one who is traditionalist in religion towards

VI. 1 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ
σπορίμων, καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤσθιον τοὺς
2 στάχυας ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν. τινὲς δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων
3 εἶπαν Τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν; καὶ
ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς Οὐδὲ τοῦτο
ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ ὅτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ
4 μετ' αὐτοῦ; [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ
τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως λαβὼν ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς
μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς
5 ἱερεῖς; καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ

1 *εν σαββατω*] add *δευτεροπρωτω* ACD mult al a f* ff$^2$ g$^{1\cdot 2}$ vg syr.hl arm ς : om pap$^4$ ℵBL 1 etc 169 33 157 b c f** q l syrr(vg hl-mg) aegg aeth 4 *ως εισηλθεν*] om *ως* BD post hunc v add D *τη αυτη ημερα θεασαμενος τινα· εργαζομενον τω σαββατω ειπεν αυτω· ανθρωπε ει μεν οιδας τι ποιεις μακαριος ει· ει δε μη οιδας επικαταρατος και παραβατης ει του νομου* 5 hunc v post 10 transponit D

the innovations of a new movement—those whose taste is less cultivated are less sensitive. The better attested χρηστός (as against χρηστότερος) gives the better sense. He who drinks old wine does not compare old and new; he is content not to try the new. The addition of εὐθέως suggests that in time he may change his mind; this introduces another thought and weakens the saying.

1-11. *Two controversial encounters with Pharisees concerning the observance of the Sabbath.* || Mk. ii. 23-iii. 6; Mt. xii. 1-14.

1. ἐν σαββάτῳ] The word δευτεροπρώτῳ, inserted after σαββάτῳ in 'Western' authorities and in the Byzantine text, has never been satisfactorily explained. See Plummer *ad loc.* Its omission is strongly supported. The suggestion is plausible that the word originated in a gloss πρώτῳ, inserted with reference to ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ *v.* 6, which was afterwards corrected to δευτέρῳ with reference to iv. 31 f. Cf. Westcott and Hort, *N.T. in Greek*, ii. p. 58.

καὶ ἤσθιον] That the disciples ate the ears of corn is of course implied, though not stated, in Mk. ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσί] Also a Lucan addition. ψώχω, cogn. with ψάω 'to rub,' is quoted elsewhere only from the medical poet Nicander, *Theriaca* 629.

2. τί ποιεῖτε] In Mk. the Pharisees complain to Jesus of the behaviour of his disciples; Lk. makes the Pharisees address themselves to the disciples direct.

3. ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυείδ] 1 Sam. xxi.

4. Lk. and Mt. both omit the inaccurate statement in Mk. ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως. According to 1 Sam. xxi. Ahimelech was priest at Nob at the time of David's visit.

τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως] On this and other expressions for the hallowed bread see Swete on Mk. ii. 26.

5. The argument here is more satisfactory if ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is made to carry the meaning 'man.' Cf. v. 24 n. The precedent cited does nothing to establish the right of the Messiah to abrogate the Sabbath: the whole point is that human need

υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ 6
εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν· καὶ ἦν
ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά· παρ- 7
ετηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἰ ἐν τῷ
σαββάτῳ ⸀θεραπεύει⸀, ἵνα εὕρωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ. αὐτὸς 8
δὲ ᾔδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, εἶπεν δὲ τῷ ἀνδρὶ τῷ
ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα Ἔγειρε καὶ στῆθι εἰς τὸ μέσον·
καὶ ἀναστὰς ἔστη. εἶπεν δὲ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτούς 9
Ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς, εἰ ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ
κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι; καὶ περιβλεψά- 10
μενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου·
ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν, καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ. Αὐτοὶ δὲ 11

7 *θεραπευει* ℵD al pauc : *θεραπευσει* B al pler ϛ

overrides a merely legal provision. So very clearly in Mk., who prefixes the words τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον (omitted both in Mt. and Lk.). D transposes this verse to follow *v.* 10 and inserts here a striking remark of Jesus upon a man whom he saw working on the Sabbath. See critical note. The source of the saying is unknown. It was perhaps, as Loisy remarks, somewhat too subtle to find a natural place in the Gospel tradition.

6. ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ] Not in Mk. ἡ δεξιά] Not in Mk. So in xxii. 50 Lk. adds to Mk. the precise statement that it was the *right* ear of the High Priest's servant that was cut off.

8. αὐτὸς δὲ ᾔδει . . . αὐτῶν] Jesus sees their intentions beforehand. A Lucan addition which balances an omission from Mk. *infra, v.* 10: in Mk. (iii. 5) when the Pharisees had failed to respond to Jesus' question he is said to be συνλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν. καὶ στῆθι] Add. Luc. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἔστη] Add. Luc.

9. ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς εἰ] Add. Luc. ἢ κακοποιῆσαι . . . ἢ ἀπολέσαι] To refrain from healing would amount to an action positively evil. The correct official answer to this question would be that healing and medical attention are permissible when life is in danger; when life is not in danger they are unconditionally forbidden. See references in S.B. on Mt. xii. 10.

10. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος] Lk. omits from Mk. the words μετ' ὀργῆς, probably from a sense of reverence.

11. This incident closes a series of controversial encounters between Jesus and the Pharisees. Mark concludes his narrative by saying that the Pharisees went out and took counsel with the Herodians to compass the destruction of Jesus. Luke is vaguer. He omits to mention the conspiracy with the Ἡρωδιανοί (they are not found in Lk., being omitted also at xx. 20 = Mk. xii. 13) and substitutes a general statement that the scribes were full of fury and considered what was to be done. The wording of the verse is characteristically Lucan. ἐπλήσθησαν] Cf. v. 26 n. ἀνοίας]

*ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας, καὶ διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.*

In N.T. only here and 2 Tim. iii. 9. Classical, cf. Plato, *Tim.* 86 B δύο δ' ἀνοίας γένη, τὸ μὲν μανίαν, τὸ δὲ ἀμαθίαν. μανία gives the meaning here. διελάλουν] In N.T. only here and i. 65. τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν] Optat. c. ἂν in indirect question representing a deliberative question in direct speech. Cf. i. 62, xv. 26; Ac. v. 24, x. 17. Blass, § 66. 3.

## The Choice of the Twelve Apostles (vi. 12-19)

Luke has inverted the Marcan order of this and the following sections, transposing the call of the Twelve (=Mk. iii. 13-19) to precede the healings (=Mk. iii. 7-12). Thus the great sermon (Lk. vi. 20 f.) is preceded in Lk. as in Mt. (iv. 23-25) by an account of miraculous cures. Possibly this corresponded to the setting of the sermon in Q. But Mark is Luke's source. The variations between Mark and Luke are not more remarkable than in many other passages, and some notable omissions may be explained by reference to Luke's procedure elsewhere. There is no sufficient basis for the argument that Luke follows here a non-Marcan source.[1]

But Luke has skilfully recast his material: at daybreak, after a night spent in prayer on the hill-top, Jesus summons his disciples, and chooses from them twelve, whom he names Apostles. With these twelve he descends from the hill, and takes his stand upon the level ground surrounded by a multitude of disciples, as well as a crowd drawn from all Palestine and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon. The sick are first healed. Then, lifting up his eyes on the assembled disciples, he speaks.

The number of 'the twelve' corresponds with the number of the twelve tribes. Cf. xxii. 29 κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν, καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν, ἵνα . . . καθῆσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. But J. Weiss (*Das Urchristentum*, p. 34) notes that in this passage the number of thrones is not specified, as it is in the (later) form of the saying in Mt. xix. 28. This, he thinks, illustrates the origin of the idea of 'the twelve apostles': twelve tribes demand twelve judges, and he argues that the conception of 'the twelve' is a later creation of the

---

[1] As maintained by Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, pp. 81 f. It would be a remarkable coincidence if the supposed Proto-Luke prefaced the great sermon with two sections in juxtaposition so closely parallel to two sections at the conclusion of the first part of Mark, which *ex hypothesi* is quite independent. Dr. Taylor's numerical method of dealing with the words peculiar to each evangelist is not satisfactory without reference to the actual similarities and dissimilarities in each case.

Church which has been read back into the lifetime of Jesus. The later origin of the idea, he holds, is confirmed by the discrepancies between the lists of names. Harnack, Loisy, E. Meyer (*Ursprung u. Anfänge*, i. pp. 296 f.), on the other hand, maintain that the choice of 'the twelve' by Jesus in his lifetime is historical. Only so can the existence of the group and its general recognition (attested by 1 Cor. xv. 5) be satisfactorily explained. Moreover the inclusion of the traitor Judas in the list is inexplicable, except on the assumption that historically it was so.

The choice of 'the twelve,' corresponding to 'the twelve tribes of Israel,' assuming it to go back to Jesus himself, corroborates other evidence that Jesus thought of himself as Messianic King.

*Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς* 12
*τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι, καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ*
*τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεφώνησεν τοὺς* 13
*μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ*

12-13. *ἐγένετο δὲ . . . ἐγένετο ἡμέρα*] By his mention of the prayer, the night-long vigil and the dawn, Lk. emphasises the momentous issues of the choice which was to be made. Mk. has simply *καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος*. But cf. Mk. i. 35, vi. 46 (from the long section omitted by Lk.), where Mk. speaks of Jesus retiring to the mountain or the desert for solitary prayer. *διανυκτερεύων*] Good Greek. Xen., Jos., Diod., etc. Here only in N.T. *προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ*] *προσευχή* c. gen. of God, here only. But cf. Wisdom xvi. 28 *εὐχαριστίαν σου* (i.e. *τοῦ θεοῦ*); Mk. xi. 22 *πίστιν θεοῦ*.

13. *προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα*] Mk. *προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἤθελεν . . . καὶ ἐποίησε δώδεκα*. Lk. interprets *οὓς ἤθελεν* as a larger group from which the twelve are selected. But it is not clear that Mk. intended this. Lk. no doubt has in mind the solemn choice of missionaries in the early Church, cf. Ac. xiii. 1 f.

*οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν*] These words are attested for Mk. iii. 14 by the great Uncials, but, as they are there omitted by D latt. syr.sin, it is probable that they are not original and have been interpolated from Lk. into Mk. In Mk. the twelve *οἱ δώδεκα* are only once (vi. 30) called *ἀπόστολοι*, and there the word has an especial appropriateness, as the twelve are just returned from a missionary tour. Mt. also speaks only once of *οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι* (x. 2 *τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα*). He prefers *δώδεκα μαθηταί* (*οἱ δώδεκα* absol. only Mt. x. 5, xxvi. 14, 47). In Jo. the word *ἀπόστολος* occurs only in xiii. 16, where it is expressly used in its etymological sense: *οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν*. Lk. on the other hand, while frequently using *οἱ δώδεκα* like Mk. (viii. 1, ix. 1, 12, xviii. 31, xxii. 3, 47), frequently also speaks of the twelve absolutely as 'the apostles' (cf. ix. 10, xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10) and here assigns the origin of the name to Jesus himself. The evidence

14 *ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, Σίμωνα ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον*
*καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ*
15 *Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν [καὶ]*
*Ἰάκωβον Ἁλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν καὶ*
16 *Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριὼθ ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης,*
17 *καὶ καταβὰς μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος*
*πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης*
*τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ*

15 *και Ιακωβον* ℵD*L 69 etc al : om *και* B al pler ϛ 17 *Ιερουσαλημ*] add *και Πιραιας* ℵ* : *και της Περεας* W ; item a b c f f² l q ,et trans fretum

points to this being a later usage: the title *ἀπόστολος* is frequently given to Paul and Barnabas, and, in Rom. xvi. 7, to Andronicus and Junias. 1 Cor. xv. 5 f. seems to distinguish 'all the apostles' from 'the twelve.' For Jewish *ἀπόστολοι* and their functions in the dispersion cf. Euseb. *in Is.* xviii. 1 f.; *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 8. 14; Jer. ad Gal. i. 1; Epiph. *adv. Haeres.* 30. 4 quoted Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, E.T. vol. i. pp. 410 f. This was probably the source of the original Christian use of the term. The application of the term to 'the twelve' as 'the apostles' *par excellence* (cf. Rev. xxi. 14) will be a later usage. Lk. omits the twofold purpose assigned in Mk. for the choice of the twelve: *ἵνα ὦσιν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν.*

14-15. Lk.'s list of the twelve is repeated in Acts i. 13-14, where all the names (except Judas Iscariot) recur, though in a slightly different order. The present list agrees with Mk. except in the following points: (1) As in Mt. x. 2 f. Andrew is denoted as Simon's brother (cf. Mk. i. 16) and his name is transferred to follow Simon's. (2) As in Mt. the surname of James and John, Βοανεργές, is omitted. Lk. also omits to repeat here that they were sons of Zebedee and brothers, cf. v. 10. (3) Θαδδαῖος, who in Mk. precedes Σιμὼν ὁ Καναναῖος, is omitted and replaced by Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (and in Ac. i. 14), who follows Σιμών. Lk.'s change of order is perhaps occasioned by the desire to avoid the sequence *James* son of Alphaeus, Judas son of *James*. A second Jude —οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης—appears in John xiv. 22. It is to be noted that the name Levi does not occur. He was son of Alphaeus (Mk. ii. 14) and therefore perhaps brother of James. Mt. ix. 9 substitutes the name Ματθαῖος for Levi in the account of Levi's call.

Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτήν] So Lk. correctly translates Mk. Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναῖον, one of the party of the Zealots. Cf. Schürer, i. 486.

17-19. These verses are greatly abbreviated from Mk. iii. 7-12. Lk. adds that the multitudes came *ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν*, where *ἀκοῦσαι* leads up to the sermon which is to follow (Mk. *ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίει*), and he adds the conclusion *ὅτι δύναμις . . . πάντας.* He changes the scene, which in Mk. is by the seashore, to a level place, and necessarily omits the order of Jesus that a boat should wait on him (cf. *v.* 1 *supra*). He also omits the testimony of the

Σιδῶνος, οἳ ἦλθαν ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων 18
αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων
ἐθεραπεύοντο· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτουν ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ, 19
ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο καὶ ἰᾶτο πάντας.

possessed and the rebuke of Jesus (Mk. 11b-12), which add nothing to iv. 31. Common to Mk. and Lk. are (1) the gathering of the multitude from Judaea (πᾶσα Ἰουδαία in Lk. is prob. meant to include Galilee, Judaea, Idumaea, and the country across Jordan separately mentioned in Mk.), Jerusalem, and the sea-board of Tyre and Sidon; (2) the healing of the sick and possessed, and (3) their pressing upon him to touch him.

### The Ethic of the Gospel (vi. 20–end)

The setting assigned by the evangelist to the Sermon is an indication of its importance as the proclamation of the new morality (see introd. to *vv.* 12-20).

*vv.* 20b-26 pronounce a reversal of the present order. The poor, the hungry, the weeping, the persecuted are blessed: corresponding woes are pronounced upon the rich, the full, the happy, and the popular.

*vv.* 27-35 enforce the law of love towards all, even enemies, and the duty of non-resistance to violence and importunity, closing with an appeal to the example of the Most High, who is good to the unthankful and to the evil.

*vv.* 36-38. Mercy and generosity must be shewn to others, if man would receive mercy and generosity.

*vv.* 39-42. The blind cannot guide or judge aright.

*vv.* 43-45. The tree is known by the fruit it bears, and the man by that which he brings forth from the treasure of his heart.

*v.* 46. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not what I say?"

*vv.* 47-49. Two comparisons illustrate the behaviour and the fate of the man who hears and does, and of the man who hears and does not.

The resemblances between this Sermon and the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v.-vii.), both in contents and in structure, are too close to be accidental: both begin with beatitudes, and both end with the comparison to the two builders. The 'woes' (*vv.* 24-26) are peculiar to Lk., but practically the whole of the rest of Luke's sermon has its counterpart in Mt. v.-vii., except *vv.* 39, 40, 45 (these are paralleled elsewhere in Mt.). With some slight, but significant, exceptions, the order of the teaching in Lk. reappears in Mt. Thus it may be taken as certain that some common source lies behind Mt. v.-vii. and Lk. vi. 20 f. The Sermon in Mt., however, includes also a large body of discourse which Lk. gives in a different connexion

(Mt. v. 13 = Lk. xiv. 34; Mt. v. 15 = Lk. xi. 33; Mt. v. 18 = Lk. xvi. 17; Mt. v. 25, 26 = Lk. xii. 58, 59; Mt. v. 32 = Lk. xvi. 18; Mt. vi. 9-13 = Lk. xi. 2-4; Mt. vi. 19-33 = Lk. xii. 33-34; xi. 34-35; xvi. 13; xii. 22-31; Mt. vii. 7-11 = Lk. xi. 9-13; Mt. vii. 13-14 = Lk. xiii. 24), as well as material peculiar to himself—notably the teaching on almsgiving, prayer, fasting (Mt. vi. 1-8, 16-18). It is a reasonable inference that, here as elsewhere, Mt. has combined together material which he found scattered in his sources, and it seems likely that, in general, Luke preserves more nearly the grouping of the common source. But it is hard to determine exactly the scope and character of the great Sermon in the common source. Is the formal contrast between the Old Law and the New, which dominates Mt. v. 21-48, the creation either of the evangelist or his special source (as Streeter would hold), or did Lk., like Mt., find it in Q? Loisy seems disposed to favour the second hypothesis: "On peut douter que Luc ait trouvé dans la source et que la rédaction ait trouvé dans Luc les préceptes de la morale chrétienne déjà mis en rapport avec les prescriptions mosaïques dont la relation de Matthieu les présente comme le perfectionnement . . . l'opposition établie entre la morale juive et la morale chrétienne devait être assez déplaisante au rédacteur, qui enseignerait plutôt l'identité; si Luc avait ici au moins une partie des antithèses qui sont dans Matthieu, le rédacteur a mieux aimé les supprimer. c. xvi. 17-18 en est un débris qu'il aura transposé en faisant valoir la permanence de la Loi" (pp. 203 f.). Streeter, on the other hand, holds that Lk. vi. 20 f. substantially reproduces Q. But a close examination of Lk. in the light of the parallels in Mt. suggests that there has been editorial re-arrangement in both Gospels. Where Lk.'s arrangement appears to be secondary and artificial, a different and probably more original grouping is found in Mt. See notes on *vv.* 29-30 and on *v.* 31. The same is perhaps true of *vv.* 39, 40. On the other hand, logical connexion is not necessarily an indication of fidelity to a primitive source. Thus, in the last section of the Sermon, the better connexion in Mt. seems to have been imposed by the evangelist upon loosely assorted material, which is more closely reproduced in Lk. See note on *vv.* 43-45.

20 *Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν*

20-23. The four beatitudes are closely parallel to the first, fourth, second and last beatitudes in Mt. v. Mt. also contains five, or (if *v.* 5 is an interpolation) four further beatitudes. All the beatitudes in Mt. except the last are expressed in the third person. Streeter suggests

Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν, ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε. 21
μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι γελάσετε.
μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν 22
ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα
ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· χάρητε 23
ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς

that Mt. has conflated four beatitudes from Q, all originally, as still in Lk., in the second person, with another group of beatitudes in the third person from another source.

20. μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί] For οἱ πτωχοί Mt. gives οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι. Similarly in his version of the next beatitude, for οἱ πεινῶντες Mt. gives οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην. These will be interpretative additions to the simpler and fresher language of the source preserved by Lk. (so Wellh.). Not mere poverty is denoted in Lk. Poverty and piety are closely linked in the Psalter (Pss. x., xxxiv., xxxv., cxl.), and the beatitude of Jesus must be interpreted in the light of this usage. Cf. also Is. lxi. 1 'to preach good tidings to the meek' (quoted above, iv. 18), trans. LXX εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς. ὑμ. ἐ. ἡ βασ. τ. θεοῦ] Ja. ii. 5 is probably a reminiscence of this beatitude: οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ πλουσίους ἐν πίστει καὶ κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας; that the kingdom is to be understood as a future compensation is shewn by the woe on the rich (*v.* 24) to whom it is said: ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν.

21. οἱ πεινῶντες] Like οἱ πτωχοί not to be pressed too literally, cf. Is. lv. 2. νῦν here and with οἱ κλαίοντες is not represented in Mt., and is perhaps a Lucan addition.

χορτασθήσεσθε] In late Gk. this word has lost the associations with the feeding of animals which cling to the word in class. Gk., e.g. Plato, *Rep.* ix. 586 A. Cf. ix. 17; Jo. vi. 26; Phil. iv. 12; Ja. ii. 16; Ps. cvi. (cvii.) 9 ὅτι ἐχόρτασεν ψυχὴν κενήν, καὶ ψυχὴν πεινῶσαν ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν.

κλαίοντες . . . γελάσετε] For 'weeping' and 'laughter' Mt. gives 'mourning' (πενθοῦντες) and 'comfort' (παρακληθήσονται).

22. ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν] Wellh. thinks that this represents a Biblical idiom "to bring forth (i.e. to spread abroad) a bad name upon," Deut. xxii. 19 (LXX trans. by ἐκφέρειν). If so, Lk. has misunderstood his text and changed the meaning by giving an article to ὄνομα. It is better to suppose that the awkward Gk. phrase in Mt. εἴπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ᾽ ὑμῶν is more original. Lk. has recast the saying and emphasised the thought of expulsion from society by the addition of ἀφορίσωσι, and by the rewriting of this clause. ἐκβαλεῖν, 'cast out' or 'reject.' τὸ ὄνομα, i.e. your name as Christians. Cf. Ja. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 14, 16.

ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] Mt. ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.

23. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ] Add. Luc., cf. νῦν *supra* v. 21.

χάρητε . . . καὶ σκιρτήσατε] An idiomatic aorist for the Pres. Imper. of Mt. χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. σκιρτάω here only and i. 41, 44 in N.T.

*ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.*

24 *Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.*

25 *οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι πεινάσετε.*
*οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.*

26 *οὐαὶ ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.*

ἰδοὺ γὰρ . . . οὐρανῷ] "This does not mean that the reward will be enjoyed in heaven and not upon the regenerated earth in the Messianic age. It means that the reward is already, as it were, existent and prepared for you with God in heaven" (Montefiore). The idea of reward is present though not prominent in the ethical teaching of Jesus; cf. *v.* 35 *infra*, Mt. vi. 1 f., xx. 1 f. It is never set forward as the motive for right conduct. The affirmation is made that conduct of a certain kind will, in fact, bring its reward. "If this is to be regarded as demoralising 'Eudaemonism,' most of the moralists who have seriously believed in immortality will incur the same condemnation" (Rashdall, *Conscience and Christ*, pp. 290 f.). Montefiore (*S.G.* ii. p. 41) complains that many Christian theologians have caricatured the 'eudaemonism' of Rabbinic theology. In fact "the eudaemonism is tempered by several other and very different strains." "The familiar doctrine of *Lishmah* . . . is the best proof that the motive of reward was regarded as the lower and less desirable motive." Yet, he allows, "it *is* true both that there is too much of measure for measure and of merit in the Rabbinic literature, and that there are some noble utterances against measure for measure and against human goodness or the service of God *meriting* reward in the teaching of Jesus." The idea of reward as purely qualitative and identical for all (Mt. xx. 1-16), and the idea that service is a mere duty which cannot merit reward (Lk. xvii. 9), he finds to be 'new' and distinctive elements in the teaching of Jesus. See also McNeile, *St. Matthew*, p. 54.

κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ . . . αὐτῶν] Mt. οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν, which Harnack and Loisy take to be the more original, the persecuting Jews not yet being regarded from without (οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν). Wellh. thinks that the difference originates in different readings of the Aramaic original. Lk. read *daq' damaihôn* as subject of the verb, and Mt. *daq' damaikôn* in appos. to 'the prophets.'

24-26. The four 'woes' which follow balance exactly the preceding beatitudes. They are peculiar to Lk., and were perhaps not part of his source. They are not addressed to the disciples then present, but to the rich and successful who are absent. The disciples are again addressed at *v.* 27 ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.

24. πλήν] A favourite word with Luke.

26. καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν] This construction c. accus. after a phrase

Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς 27
ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς 28
καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων
ὑμᾶς. τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν 29
ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν
χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς. παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ 30

like *καλῶς εἰπεῖν* is correct but unusual in N.T. It is a slight confirmation of the hypothesis that the 'woes' were not in the source. The dat. *τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις* after the similar phrase *κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖν* balances *τοῖς προφήταις v.* 23. Below, *v.* 27, *καλῶς ποιεῖν* governs the dat., but *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* c. accus. *v.* 33.

27-35. Love towards enemies is the ruling thought of this section, finally resumed at *v.* 35 and enforced by appeal to the example of God. There is close parallel to Mt. v. 44-48. Combined with this is teaching on the patient endurance of evil, *vv.* 29-30. It is to be noted that in *vv.* 29-30 the 2nd pers. *sing.* of the imperat. is used, but that in the preceding and following verses the plural form is found. This suggests conflation of sources. Verses 29-30 are closely parallel to Mt. v. 39-42, and in Mt. these verses are a distinct section. The last clause of this section in Mt.—on the duty of lending—has a somewhat longer counterpart in Lk., *vv.* 34-35. Here too the present grouping in Lk. may well be due to conflation: the duty of lending does not fall in happily with the general duties of *ἀγαπᾶν* and *ἀγαθοποιεῖν*. Verse 31 'The Golden Rule' has also been probably intruded. In Mt. it occurs in another context, vii. 12.

27. *τοῖς ἀκούουσι*] See above on *vv.* 24-26.

28. *καλῶς ποιεῖτε . . . καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς*] These two clauses have no equivalent in Mt. Rom. xii. 14 provides a close parallel: *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε.* The whole paragraph in Rom. echoes this teaching of Jesus: cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 23.

*περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων*] Mt. *ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων. ἐπηρεάζω*, 'to molest,' 'to insult.' Freq. in papyri; class.; in N.T. here only and 1 Pet. iii. 16.

29. *τῷ τύπτοντί σε*] Mt. *ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει.* Suidas *ῥαπίσαι· πατάσσειν τὴν γνάθον ἁπλῇ τῇ χειρί.* A vulgarism. *τὸ ῥάπισμα οὐκ ἐν χρήσει* Phryn. clii. Mt. then prob. preserves the original which Lk. has refined. *ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα*] Mt. *εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα σου. πάρεχε*] Prob. another Lucan improvement. Mt. *στρέψον.*

*καὶ ἀπὸ . . . κωλύσῃς*] The robber seizes the outer garment (*ἱμάτιον*) and is not to be refused the under garment (*χιτών*). Mt. *καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον.* The adversary in Mt. resorts to legal proceedings, not violence, and claims the *χιτών*, and the injunction is that the *ἱμάτιον* is to be given too.

30. *παντὶ αἰτοῦντι*] Perhaps an editorial strengthening of *τῷ αἰτοῦντι* (Mt.), cf. v. 28, xi. 4. *καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ . . . ἀπαίτει*] This general injunction, which seems to add little to *v.* 29b, is probably editorial. So Harnack, *S.J.* p. 60. The teaching of the corresponding verse in Mt. (*καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπό σου*

31 *τοῦ αἴροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει. καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα*
32 *ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως. καὶ*
*εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;*
*καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν.*
33 *καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ὑμᾶς,*
*ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.*
34 *καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις*
*[ἐστίν]; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν ἵνα ἀπο*

33 *και γαρ* codd paene omn: om *γαρ* ℵB    34 *χαρις εστιν*] om *εστιν* B e

*δανίσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῇς*) appears later, *vv.* 34, 35.

31. || Mt. vii. 12, where to the Rule is added: *οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται.* The formulation of the Golden Rule in this its positive form appears to be original with Jesus. In its negative form it was clearly formulated by Hillel, *Sabbath* 31a, "That which thou hatest, do not to thy fellow; this is the whole Law, and all the rest is commentary," and in Tobit iv. 15 *ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς.* The negative form is also found in the Western text of the Apostolic Decree (Ac. xv.) and in *Did.* i. 2, and is presupposed in Rom. xiii. Also Philo (*ap.* Eus. *Praep.* viii. 7), *ἅ τις παθεῖν ἐχθαίρει, μὴ ποιεῖν αὐτόν.* Partial parallels from classical writers will be found in Wettstein, i. p. 341, of which the most striking is Isocr. *Nic.* 61 *ἃ πάσχοντες ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὀργίζεσθε ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ ποιεῖτε* (cited by Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. liv. n. 43, in his indictment of Calvin in the matter of Servetus). But this, as the context shews, is not intended as a general ethical maxim. King Nicocles is addressing his subordinate officials, and the sentence quoted is to be expounded in the light of § 49 *supra* *τοιούτους εἶναι χρὴ περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους οἷόν περ ἐμὲ περὶ ὑμᾶς ἀξιοῦτε γίγνεσθαι.* See Jacob Bernays, *Ges. Abhandl.* i. p. 274 f.; Abrahams, *Studies*, i. p. 21. The words *quod tibi fieri nonvis, alteri ne feceris*, which Severus (*Vita*, *Hist. Aug.* c. 51) inscribed on his palace, *audierat a quibusdam sive Judaeis sive Christianis.* The Golden Rule in its negative form was prescribed by Confucius, *Analects*, Bk. xv., c. xxiii. (Legge, *Chinese Classics*, i. p. 301): Tsze-kung asked, saying, "Is there one word which may serve as a rule of practice for all one's life?" The Master said, "Is not Reciprocity such a word? What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others."

32. We return to the injunction to love enemies. *χάρις* (a Lucan word; not in Mk. or Mt.), 'favour,' i.e. from God; equivalent in meaning to *μισθός* *v.* 35. Mt. *τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε;* For *ἁμαρτωλοί*, *vv.* 32, 33, Mt. gives first *τελῶναι*, then *ἐθνικοί*. It is hard to say whether Mt. has given a Judaic colouring to a more general form of speech preserved in Lk., or whether Lk. has generalised a Judaic original in the interest of Gentile readers. Probably the latter.

33. *ἀγαθοποιῆτε* c. an object here only in N.T. Cf. *v.* 26 *supra.* Mt. v. 47 reads *ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον*, which Lk. probably found in his source and interpreted. (So Harnack, *S.J.* p. 62.)

34. On this verse, which has no

*λάβωσιν τὰ ἴσα. πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ* 35
*ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες· καὶ ἔσται ὁ*
*μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολύς, καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου, ὅτι αὐτὸς*
*χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς. Γίνεσθε* 36

35 *μηδεν* ABDL codd paene omn latt aegg : *μηδενα* ℵWΞΠ* 489 syrr

counterpart in Mt. v. 43-47, see above on *vv.* 27-35.

35. *μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες*] The context imperatively demands the meaning 'without hoping to receive anything back.' So Vulg. (cod. Am. and others), 'nihil inde sperantes,' and A.V. This meaning of *ἀπελπίζω* is unparalleled. The vb. is not uncommon in the later Gk., but it consistently means elsewhere 'to despair' or 'to despair of.' So Old Lat. 'nihil desperantes' and R.V. in this place. But this interpretation cannot be reconciled with the context. The required interpretation of *ἀπελπίζοντες* is perhaps eased by *ἀπολάβωσι supra*, so that *ἀπελπίζοντες = ἐλπίζοντες ἀπολαβεῖν*. So Field, *Otium Norvic.* iii. p. 40. ℵ and a few other MSS., supported by the Syriac versions, read *μηδένα ἀπελπίζοντες*. This would mean 'despairing of nobody,' and is so translated in the Syriac versions. This again is out of harmony with the context, which requires an antithesis to *ἵνα ἀπολάβωσι τὰ ἴσα*. The support of the Peshitto has been claimed for assigning a transitive meaning to *ἀπελπίζοντες*—'causing no man to despair.' But Field (*l.c.*) shews that this is a misunderstanding of the Syriac, and, in the passages adduced from Greek (Ecclus. xxvii. 21 and *Anth.* xi. 114), the ordinary meaning of *ἀπελπίζω* yields a better sense. The passage in Ecclus. xxvii. 16 f. describes throughout the fate of the unfaithful friend, not of the man betrayed.

*καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου*] Mt. *ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. *Ὕψιστος* absol. and without art. also i. 32, 35, 76. Freq. in LXX (e.g. Ps. lxxxi. (lxxxii.) 6 *ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοί ἐστε, καὶ υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου πάντες*) and in late Hellenistic Jewish lit. Cf. Bousset, *R.J.* p. 310.

*ὅτι αὐτὸς . . . πονηρούς*] Wellh. thinks that this clause has been added to provide a connexion with *v.* 36, and argues that its omission leaves it to be understood that 'to be sons of God' defines the *μισθός* without connoting the idea of moral likeness to God. But the parallel in Mt. guarantees the originality of the comparison between the generosity of God and the ethic enjoined by the Gospel. It is hard to understand why Lk. has abbreviated the beautiful expression of the thought which is preserved in Mt. and which can hardly not be original: *ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους*. Perhaps, as Loisy suggests, it was too simple for his taste. *ἀχαρίστους* may be an amendment to harmonise with the idea introduced by *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* and *δανείζειν*.

36. *γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες κτλ.*] These words in Lk. introduce the subsequent teaching which forbids judgement upon others; note the conjunction *καί* at the beginning of *v.* 37. The parallel in Mt. is made to conclude the preceding section on loving enemies, *ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν*, and is divided from the parallel to Lk. *v.* 37 f. (vii. 1 f.)

37 οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν· καὶ μὴ
κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ
38 καταδικασθῆτε. ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε· δίδοτε, καὶ
δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον
ὑπερεκχυννόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν· ᾧ γὰρ
39 μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. Εἶπεν
δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς Μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν

by a long section (*c.* vi.) which is not represented in the Lucan sermon. In xix. 21 (= Mk. x. 21) Mt. has interpolated the words εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι. It is therefore not unlikely that in *v.* 48 also τέλειος is due to Mt. and that the thought (if not the wording) of the source is preserved in Lk. τέλειος is found in Mt. only of the evangelists. οἰκτίρμων in N.T. occurs only here and Ja. v. 11 πολύσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος καὶ οἰκτίρμων, but is not infrequent in LXX, esp. in Psalter.

37-38. Mt. (vii. 1 f.) has no parallel to the words καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε . . . εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν, and he passes direct from the first clause μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε, followed by the statement ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν (cf. Lk. *v.* 38b), to the parable of the beam and mote (vii. 3-5 = Lk. *vv.* 41-42). This gives a clear connexion. The connexion in Lk. is less obvious. Whether the obscurity is due to Lk.'s conflation, or was already present in the source, is uncertain. μέτρον in Mt. connotes the idea of a standard of judgement, but in Lk.'s version μέτρον is a measure of *capacity*, and the saying expands the thought of δίδοτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, which is not present in the parallel in Mt. Sayings of Jesus, similar to, though not identical with, those in this section, are cited in Polyc. ii. 3 and 1 Clem. Rom. 13. In the latter ὡς δίδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν precedes ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεσθε, and thus gives an independent warrant for the Lucan connexion of ideas. καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε] It is the judgement of God, not of fellow-men which is here intended. So with the passives in apodosis which follow. Cf. xi. 4 ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν. δώσουσι] Impersonal plural—the equivalent of a passive. Cf. xii. 20 τὴν ψυχήν σου αἰτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ. εἰς τὸν κόλπον] The fold of the garment used as a pocket. Cf. Is. lxv. 7, Ps. lxxix. 12, and Latin and Gk. parallels in Wettstein *ad loc.*

39. εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς] A favourite Lucan phrase, not found in the other evv., which confirms the impression that the following sayings are not in their original setting.

39-40. These two sayings are not in the great Sermon in Mt., but occur in different connexions: the former, Mt. xv. 14, where it is interpolated by Mt. into the account of the controversy with the Pharisees (|| Mark vii.), the latter, Mt. x. 24, 25, in the charge to the Twelve. But the saying in Mt. x. combines mention of the relation of slave and master with that of teacher and disciple, is lacking in the word and the idea of κατηρτισμένος, and leads on to the conclusion: εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐπεκάλεσαν, πόσῳ

ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται; οὐκ ἔστιν 40
μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται
ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ. Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ 41
ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ
ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς; πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου 42
Ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου,
αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σοῦ δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων; ὑποκριτά,
ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σοῦ, καὶ τότε
διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου
ἐκβαλεῖν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν 43

μᾶλλον τοὺς οἰκιακοὺς αὐτοῦ. In Lk. the two sayings are thrown into connexion with the following parable of the beam and the mote. The former emphasises the need of clear vision in the teacher. The meaning of the second is obscure. It might continue the thought of the preceding *v.* thus: "A blind man can be no guide, and a pupil is not a master," i.e. "there is no master except Jesus, and only complete agreement with him can give the authority of a teacher in the Christian Church." So Wellh. But it is subtle. Another suggestion is that it continues the warning against blind teachers: if the teacher is blind, the pupil will never get beyond him. The saying in any case will be proverbial in origin, and its present position is probably editorial only.

41-42 (|| Mt. vii. 3-5). This saying in Mt. follows excellently upon the precept not to judge. The position here is less suitable. The preceding sayings seem to suggest an interpretation of this saying as a warning against the blindness of a would-be guide, rather than (as in Mt.) as an injunction to a disciple to practise self-criticism. The splinter and the beam in the eye were proverbial. For Rabbinic parallels see S.B. on Mt. vii. 3, and for the thought cf. poet. ignot. *apud* Plut. *De curios.* 515 d τί τἀλλότριον, ἄνθρωπε βασκανώτατε, | κακὸν ὀξυδερκεῖς, τὸ δ' ἴδιον παραβλέπεις; Hor. *Sat.* I. iii. 25 "cum tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis, cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutum ?"

41. ἰδίῳ] Mt. σῷ; cf. ἰδίου *v.* 44 *infra.*

42. Ἀδελφέ] Om. Mt. A self-complacent form of address, which contrasts well with ὑποκριτά *infra.*

αὐτὸς . . . οὐ βλέπων] Better Greek and prob. less original than Mt. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου. οὐ c. part. here only in Lk.

43-45. As the quality and character of a tree is discovered from its fruit, so a man is known by what he produces from the treasure of his heart. From the heart speech overflows. Mt. vii. 16-18 provides at the corresponding place in the Sermon on the Mount a close parallel to *vv.* 43-44, but *v.* 45 has no parallel in Mt. at this point. However, in Mt. xii. 33-35 there is a doublet to the saying about trees and their fruit, followed in this case by a close parallel to Lk., vi. 45. The literary history of the sayings is hard to disentangle. Mt. vii. 15-27 gives an excellent connexion throughout, with

*σαπρόν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν.*
44 *ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκεται· οὐ*
*γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σῦκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν*
45 *τρυγῶσιν. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ*
*τῆς καρδίας προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ*
*πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν· ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος*
46 *καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.* Τί *δέ με καλεῖτε* Κύριε

the importance of 'doing' as the dominant note. The rotten trees answer to false prophets—the wolves in sheep's clothing—who are to be known from their fruits. These lead on by an easy transition to the saying "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord," etc., and finally to the concluding parables. The connexion in Lk. is less satisfactory. The fruit, good and bad, answers to the overflowing of the heart's treasure in speech. This differs from the thought in Mt. vii. 15 f. and also from the thought of the foll. *v.* 46 (|| Mt. vii. 21), which rebukes insincere speech. But the better connexion is not necessarily the more primitive, and it seems probable that Matthew has been revising his sources; thus the reference to false prophets (vii. 15) is probably editorial. If Lk. here reproduces the source (so Loisy, Wellh.), Mt. may have deliberately transposed—and expanded—the original of Lk. vi. 45, in order to improve the connexion in this section of the Sermon. Lagrange thinks that Mt. preserves the original and that Lk. has conflated.

In Mt. vii. 16-18 the parallels to *vv.* 43 and 44 come in inverse order and with other differences. *οὐ γάρ ἐστι . . . ποιοῦν . . . οὐδὲ πάλιν . . .*, Mt. *οὐ δύναται . . . ἐνεγκεῖν, οὐδε . . .*

43. *ποιοῦν καρπόν*] Cf. iii. 8 n.

44. *ἕκαστον γὰρ . . . γινώσκεται*] The parallel in Mt. xii. 33b lacks *ἕκαστον* and *ἰδίου*, cf. *v.* 41.

*ἐξ ἀκανθῶν . . . σῦκα . . . ἐκ βάτου σταφυλήν*] Mt. *ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὰς . . . ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα.* The variation is probably due to editing by Lk. The idea of looking for fruit on *τρίβολοι* 'thistles' seemed too remote. Lk. also adds *τρυγῶσι*, the technical word for gathering in the vintage.

45. *προφέρει*] Mt. xii. 35 *ἐκβάλλει.*

*ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος . . . αὐτοῦ*] In Mt. xii. 34 the general statement precedes the particular statements. *αὐτοῦ* not in Mt.

46. Mt. vii. 21 *οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι* Κύριε *κύριε εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* It is hard to decide whether Mt. has expanded (Wellh., Bultmann) or Lk. has abbreviated. Harnack questions whether Mt. vii. 21 and Lk. vi. 46 are really derived from Q. But that a corresponding saying was present in the common source is plainly indicated by the position of the saying in each gospel. Probably Lk. is nearer to the source. In Clem. Hom. viii. 7 a narrative is constructed for the saying: *ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν πρός τινα πυκνότερον κύριον αὐτὸν λέγοντα, μηδὲν δὲ ποιοῦντα ὧν αὐτὸς προσέταξεν, ἔφη· τί με λέγεις· κύριε κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖς ἃ λέγω; οὐ γὰρ ὠφελήσει τινὰ τὸ*

κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω; πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με καὶ 47
ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων καὶ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι
ἐστὶν ὅμοιος· ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν ὃς 48
ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν·
πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης προσέρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ
ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν σαλεῦσαι αὐτὴν διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκο-
δομῆσθαι αὐτήν. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας ὅμοιός ἐστιν 49

48 δια το καλως οικοδομησθαι αυτην ℵBLWΞ 33 157 syr.hl-mg aegg: τεθεμελιωτο γαρ επι την πετραν ACD mult al latt syrr(vg.hl) arm ς ex Matt vii. 25: om 700 syr.sin

λέγειν ἀλλὰ τὸ ποιεῖν. "My Lord, my Lord," "Mari, Mari," was a common form of respectful address. Cf. b. Makkoth 23b-24a (Goldschmidt, vii. pp. 606 f.), "Who is he who honours them that fear the Lord (Ps. xv. 4)? That is King Josaphat, king of Judah, who when he saw a pupil of the scribes rose from his throne and embraced him, and kissed him and addressed him My Father, my Father, my Master, my Master (Rabbi, Rabbi), my Lord, my Lord (Mari, Mari)." Cf. Fiebig, *Jesu Bergpredigt*, p. 147. To the two verses (22, 23) which follow in Mt. vii. there is a partial parallel in Lk. xiii. 25 f., *q.v.* Bultmann (p. 70) thinks that Mt. here represents the source and that Lk. has transposed the saying, quoting 2 Clem. iv. 5 for the connexion of ideas in Mt. It is perhaps more likely that Mt. has interpolated.

47-49. The Lucan version of the concluding parables differs from the Matthaean (vii. 24-27) both in style and content. In style the rhythmical parallelism of the Matthaean version disappears, mainly owing to the insertion ὑποδείξω . . . ὅμοιος in *v.* 47 (cf. for this xii. 5), the gen. absol. and the constr. of prep. c. infin. in *v.* 48, the omission of objects to ἀκούσας and μὴ ποιήσας in *v.* 49, and the addition of χωρὶς θεμελίου. In content Lk. founds the moral upon a point which is not found in Mt. By the addition of ὃς ἔσκαψεν . . . θεμέλιον, *v.* 48, the substitution of διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομῆσθαι αὐτήν for τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, and the addition of χωρὶς θεμελίου, he makes the main point of contrast between the two builders that the one built upon a foundation and that the other did not. A difference in climatic and geographic conditions is also implied. In Mt. the houses are tested by a great storm which creates an overflowing torrent. The picture answers to conditions in Palestine. Lk. on the other hand says nothing of wind and rain and refers only to a river rising in flood. Mt. seems to be the more original, for it is hard to see why he should have omitted reference to digging a foundation had he found it in his source, while the point is an 'improvement' which might well occur to an editor. A striking parallel to these comparisons is quoted from *Aboth Rabbi Nathan* xxiv.: "Elisha b. Abuya (*c.* A.D. 120 the *apostate* Rabbi) said, 'A man who does good works and studies diligently in the Law, what is he like? He is like a man who builds first with great stones and then lays upon them his unbaked bricks; and when floods come and wash

ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου, ᾗ προσέρηξεν ὁ ποταμός, καὶ εὐθὺς συνέπεσεν, καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα.

round the walls, they cannot move them. But to whom is he like who studies in the Law, but has little merit? He is like a man who lays a foundation with unbaked bricks.'" Burkitt has suggested that R. Nathan may have got the comparison of the two houses and their builders from the Gospel, probably second-hand, and may have ascribed it to Elisha the heretic to avoid offence, *J.Th.S.* xv. p. 618; cf. Abrahams, *Studies*, i. p. 92; Fiebig, *Gleichnisreden Jesu*, pp. 81-82.

## The Healing of the Centurion's Servant (vii. 1-10)

The miraculous healing of the centurion's servant is found also in Mt. (viii. 5 f.), and in almost the same position, viz. after the conclusion of the great Sermon. (In Mt. the healing of the leper, from Mk. i. 40 f., has been placed immediately after the Sermon, and before the healing of the centurion's servant.) It may be presumed to have been taken from Q. In each Gospel, and therefore in Q, the story leads up to the saying of Jesus, "Not in Israel have I found so great faith," and the centurion stands as a type of a believing Gentile. Mt. has emphasised this aspect of the story by interpolating into the narrative the saying "Many shall come from the east and the west," etc., which Lk. gives later in another connexion (xiii. 28 f.). The chief difference between Mt. and Lk. is that in Mt. the centurion himself comes to Jesus with his petition, whereas in Lk. he approaches him through two successive embassies—first, elders of the Jews, and secondly, friends. This seems artificial, and there can be no doubt that Mt. gives the story in a more original form. The words of the centurion (6b-8) are in place when the centurion speaks himself; they are not in place when repeated by his friends, who, as Wellh. says, appear to have learnt the centurion's words by heart. It seems possible that the symbolic character of the centurion, as typifying Gentile believers, has encouraged the expansion of the story as given in Lk. Like later Gentile believers, the centurion never meets Jesus in the flesh, but communicates with him and receives his benefits through intermediaries. We may compare the Greeks in Jo. xii. 20, who, wishing to see Jesus, approach Philip. Their request, when reported to Jesus, leads up to the saying, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to myself," but the evangelist seems to intend us to understand that they did not see Jesus in the flesh.

In Mt. Jesus appears to exhibit at first some reluctance to enter the house of a Gentile (if, that is, with Wellh. and others we read viii. 7 as a question) and only yields to the centurion's insistent faith. This is in line with the story of the healing of the Syrophenician woman's daughter (Mk. vii. 24 f.)—a narrative which has the further point in common with this miracle that the healing is performed from a distance. This *motif* of an initial reluctance on the part of Jesus is not present in Lk. The centurion forbears to come himself out of personal humility, and is only anxious to save Jesus the trouble of a journey to his house. The account of the healing of Jairus's daughter has perhaps influenced Luke's story at this point (cf. *v.* 6 Κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου with Mk. v. 35 τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον;).

VII.
Ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς 1
τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

Ἑκατοντάρχου δέ τινος δοῦλος κακῶς ἔχων ἤμελλεν 2
τελευτᾶν, ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ ἔντιμος. ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 3
ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ. οἱ δὲ 4
παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν σπουδαίως λέγοντες ὅτι ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ τοῦτο, ἀγαπᾷ 5
γὰρ τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτὸς ᾠκοδόμησεν
ἡμῖν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς. ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ 6
οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἔπεμψεν φίλους ὁ
ἑκατοντάρχης λέγων αὐτῷ Κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου, οὐ γὰρ

1 επειδη ABC al : επει δε ℵL e f mult al ϛ : και εγενετο οτε D b ff$^2$ l q

1. ἐπειδή] *v.l.* ἐπεί. Neither word is used elsewhere in the N.T. in a temporal sense. The reading of D is probably assimilated to Mt. viii. 28.

2. δοῦλος] Mt. παῖς, and this was probably the word used in the source, since it is also found in Lk. v. 7. The word, like the English 'boy,' is ambiguous, and might mean 'servant' or 'son.' Lk. interprets in the former sense, and Jo. apparently in the latter.

ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν] So in Jo. iv. 47 ἤμελλεν γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν.

4. ἄξιος ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ] Cf. Latin *dignus qui* c. subj., and see Blass, § 65. 8.

5. τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτὸς ᾠκοδόμησεν] A similar case of a pagan official assisting in the building of a Jewish place of prayer seems to be attested by an Egyptian inscr. of the second cent. B.C. (Dittenberger, *O.G.I.S.* 96), Ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας Πτολεμαῖος Ἐπικύδου ὁ ἐπιστάτης τῶν φυλακιτῶν καὶ οἱ ἐν Ἀθρίβει Ἰουδαῖοι τὴν προσευχὴν θεῷ ὑψίστῳ.

7 *ἱκανός εἰμι ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς· διὸ οὐδὲ
ἐμαυτὸν ἠξίωσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν· ἀλλὰ εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ*
8 *ἰαθήτω ὁ παῖς μου· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξου-
σίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω
τούτῳ Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλῳ Ἔρχου, καὶ
ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ.*
9 *ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν αὐτόν, καὶ στρα-
φεὶς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπεν Λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ*
10 *ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον. καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες
εἰς τὸν οἶκον οἱ πεμφθέντες εὗρον τὸν δοῦλον ὑγιαίνοντα.*

7 *διο ουδε . . . ελθειν* om D a b c e ff$^2$ l. syr.sin *ιαθητω* BL boh (codd) sah: *ιαθησεται* codd omn rell ut vid ϛ; fortasse ex Matt viii. 8

7. *διὸ οὐδὲ . . . πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν*] These words are necessarily absent from Mt., where the centurion presents his own request. The man's personal humility gives the reason why he not only desires to prevent the entry of Jesus into his house, but has also chosen to approach Jesus through the elders and his friends. The omission of the words in D and MSS. of Old Latin may well be due to the influence of Mt. Wellh. thinks that the sentence is an interpretative gloss. But in the Lucan form of the narrative they directly help the story, and are probably as old as the other modifications in Lk.

8. The thought seems to be that as he, the centurion, where he is in power, has but to speak the word to be obeyed, so Jesus in exerting the power committed to him needs but to speak and the deed is done.

## THE WIDOW'S SON AT NAIN (vii. 11-17)

Like Elijah and Elisha, the new Prophet raises from death the only son of a widow. The narrative is peculiar to Lk. and may be assigned to the series of narratives derived from Lk.'s special source. Note especially the use of *ὁ κύριος* in *v.* 13, and the echoes of the LXX in *vv.* 15 and 17. As compared with the Marcan story of the raising of Jairus's daughter, the miracle is enhanced by the circumstance that the corpse is actually on the way to burial. We may compare the story again with the raising of Lazarus, where the body has been already four days in the tomb when life is restored.

The incident is described with picturesque detail and with a conscious delight in the story-teller's art. Jesus, attended by his disciples and a large multitude, approaches the city at the very moment that the funeral procession issues forth. The sorrowing widow, the sympathetic townsfolk, Jesus moved with compassion, the bearers, the young man, are all vividly portrayed. The miracle proceeds entirely from the compassion of Jesus. There is no mention of faith or place for its operation.

The detail finds close parallel in a miracle ascribed to Apollonius of Tyana. Philostratus, *Vita* iv. 45 *κόρη ἐν ὥρᾳ γάμου τεθνάναι ἐδόκει καὶ ὁ νυμφίος ἠκολούθει τῇ κλίνῃ βοῶν ὁπόσα ἐπ' ἀτελεῖ γάμῳ, ξυνωλοφύρετο δὲ καὶ ἡ Ῥώμη . . . παρατυχὼν οὖν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος τῷ πάθει, Κατάθεσθε, ἔφη, τὴν κλίνην· ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑμᾶς τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ κόρῃ δακρύων παύσω . . . οἱ μὲν δὴ πολλοὶ ᾤοντο λόγον ἀγορεύσειν αὐτόν . . ., ὁ δ' οὐδὲν ἀλλ' ἢ προσαψάμενος αὐτῆς καί τι ἀφανῶς ἐπειπὼν ἀφύπνισε τὴν κόρην τοῦ δοκοῦντος θανάτου, καὶ φωνήν θ' ἡ παῖς ἀφῆκεν κτλ.*

Baur (*Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus*) held that the miracle in Philostratus was a conscious imitation of the Gospel miracle. But this is an unnecessary assumption. (Cf. Weinreich, *Antike Wundererzählungen*, Excursus A.) The *motif* of the restoration to life of a person about to be buried or cremated is found in other pagan stories. Cf. Apuleius, *Florida* 19 (a miracle of Asclepiades), and for a similar incident in the romance of Iamblichus see E. Rohde, *Griech. Roman*², p. 287 n. 2.

The insertion of the miracle at this point in the Gospel prepares the way for the reply of Jesus to the messengers of John which follows. See *vv.* 18, 22.

*Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν καλου-* 11
*μένην Ναίν, καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*
*καὶ ὄχλος πολύς. ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως,* 12
*καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκὼς μονογενὴς υἱὸς τῇ μητρὶ*
*αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὴ ἦν χήρα, καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὸς*
*ἦν σὺν αὐτῇ. καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ὁ κύριος ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ'* 13

11 *εν τω εξης* ABLΘ 69 etc 700 al a b vg sah syr.sin : om *εξης* 1 etc : *εν τη εξης* ℵCDW perm al c e f boh syrr (vg.hl) arm ϛ 13 *κυριος*] *Ιησους* D syr.sin

11. *ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς*] sc. *χρόνῳ*. *ἑξῆς* Lucan only in N.T.

*Ναίν*] The modern *Nein*. Not mentioned elsewhere in the Bible. It is situated between Endor and Shunem—the latter the spot where Elisha raised the widow's son—and therefore some considerable distance S.W. of Capernaum. It is said that rock-graves are to be found before the east gate of Nain on the road which leads to Capernaum.

12. *ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν*] Lucan only in N.T., cf. xix. 41.

*ἐξεκομίζετο*] Here only in Greek Bible. The word is used of carrying out a corpse in Polybius, Plut., etc.

13. *ὁ κύριος*] This is the first occurrence of the usage, frequent in Lk., which describes Jesus as *ὁ*

14 *αὐτῇ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ* Μὴ *κλαῖε. καὶ προσελθὼν ἥψατο*
*τῆς σοροῦ, οἱ δὲ βαστάζοντες ἔστησαν, καὶ εἶπεν* Νεανίσκε,
15 *σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθητι. καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς καὶ ἤρξατο*
16 *λαλεῖν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ.* Ἔλαβεν *δὲ φόβος*
*πάντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες ὅτι* Προφήτης
*μέγας ἠγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ὅτι* Ἐπεσκέψατο *ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν*
17 *αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ* Ἰουδαίᾳ *περὶ*
*αὐτοῦ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ.*

14 *νεανισκε*] iter *νεανισκε* D a ff$^2$ Diat cf. viii. 54 infra

*κύριος* in narrative. The primitive confession that (the exalted) Jesus is *κύριος* has reacted upon the form of narratives describing his life on earth. The usage is not found in Mk. or in Mt., and in Lk. it is almost entirely confined to passages peculiar to the evangelist or to introductions which he has furnished to other material. See vii. 19, x. 1, 39, 41, xi. 39, xii. 42, xiii. 15, xvii. 5, xviii. 6, xix. 8, xxii. 31, 61, xxiv. 3. The MSS. frequently give variants as D syr.sin here, but these may in general be safely assigned to the influence of the more usual usage of the Gospels. The usage is frequent in the Gospel of Peter. [Mk.] xvi. 19 is scarcely a parallel. It may be inferred from the circumstance that the usage is never found where Lk. is directly reproducing his Marcan source, that it was not originated by the evangelist, but that it was found by him already existing in his special source.

14. *τῆς σοροῦ*] 'The bier' or 'the coffin.' Here only in N.T. But cf. Gen. l. 26 of the coffin in which the body of Joseph was laid in Egypt. Wellh., holding that *σορός* must mean 'coffin,' sees here a reflection of Greek custom, since coffins were not in common use among the Jews; cf. Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 197; *Vita* 323. But instances of the word *σορός* from papyri in M.M. seem to shew clearly that *σορός* may be used for a bier, e.g. *Pap. Lond.* cxxi. 236 (third cent. A.D.) *ὁ ἐπὶ σωρῷ κατακείμενος*.

15. *ἀνεκάθισεν*] In Greek Bible only here and Ac. ix. 40.

*καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ*] = 3 Regn. xvii. 23 (of Elijah) *ad literam*. Cf. also 4 Regn. iv. 36.

16. *ἔλαβεν δὲ φόβος πάντας*] Lucan. Cf. i. 65, v. 9, 26.

*προφήτης μέγας*] Like Elijah and Elisha of old. And cf. *v.* 39 *infra*, xxiv. 19.

*ἐπεσκέψατο κτλ.*] Frequent in LXX of a divine visitation: Gen. xxi. 1, l. 24 f.; Ruth i. 6; cf. *supra* i. 68, 78; Ac. xv. 14.

17. *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ κτλ.*] i.e. in the whole of Palestine and beyond.

## JESUS AND JOHN (vii. 18-35)

A collection of sayings relating to John the Baptist, which, as the parallel in Mt. xi. proves, goes back essentially in its present form to Q, and therefore in all probability to the primitive Palestinian community. The collection of sayings gives answers to two questions: "What did John think of Jesus?"

and "What did Jesus think of John?" (J. Weiss). There are various indications that the disciples of John retained for some time their identity as a separate group (Mk. ii. 18; Lk. xi. 1; Acts xix. 1 f.), and it was therefore inevitable that the relations of the two prophets to each other should be a matter of lively interest. It is impossible to determine with precision how far the existing texts reproduce actual spoken words of Jesus and to what extent they have been shaped by the reflections of the early community. Wellhausen is probably right in detecting a retrospective attitude in the paragraph as a whole. This is particularly noticeable in the concluding verses (33-35). Personal impressions of Jesus and of John are still fresh, but the compilers look back upon what each has been and has done.

It is only in Matthew and John that the Baptist is represented as recognising the character and the mission of Jesus from the beginning. These representations in all probability give theory in dramatic form. If the Matthaean and the Johannine conception is excluded here, we are given a picture of the Baptist receiving news of the works of Jesus and beginning to wonder whether he is perhaps that 'coming one' of whom he had spoken. The incident as here recorded (cf. note on *v.* 18) represents the beginning of faith, not the beginning of doubt. This, too, may be theory in dramatic form (cf. *v.* 19 n.).

Jesus associates John's message with his own. They have both appealed to and both been rejected by their generation. The wisdom of God spoke by them both. John is the greatest of men: a prophet and more than a prophet; the messenger of whom Malachi foretold that he would prepare the way for the coming of the Messiah. At the same time John belongs to the old order, not to the new. "He that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he." There is probably later reflection in some of these sayings (cf. *vv.* 27, 28 nn.). But the powerful and ironical appeal of *vv.* 24, 25, "What went ye out into the wilderness to see?" and the parable of the children in the market-place (*vv.* 31-32) read like authentic reminiscence of the spoken word.

*Καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν Ἰωάνει οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ πάντων* 18
*τούτων. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν*

18. *περὶ πάντων τούτων*] i.e. the preaching and the miracles which have been recorded since the last mention of John at the baptism of Jesus, c. iii. Mt. *ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ.* The last words probably imply that John, who had believed Jesus to be the Messiah (cf. Mt. iii. 14, 15), is now led to doubt his earlier belief. This is not suggested in Lk.

*καὶ προσκ. δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν*]

19 αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰωάνης ἔπεμψεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον λέγων Σὺ εἶ ὁ
20 ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; παραγενόμενοι δὲ πρὸς
αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες εἶπαν Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἀπέστειλεν
ἡμᾶς πρὸς σὲ λέγων Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσ-
21 δοκῶμεν; ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς ἀπὸ
νόσων καὶ μαστίγων καὶ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν, καὶ τυφλοῖς
22 πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάνει ἃ εἴδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε·
τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται
καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται·
23 καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.
24 Ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰωάνου ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς

The *two* disciples are not mentioned in Mt. For the wording cf. Ac. xxiii. 23 *καὶ προσκαλεσάμενός τινας δύο τῶν ἑκατονταρχῶν.*

*πρὸς τὸν κύριον*] Cf. *supra*, *v.* 13 n. Ἰησοῦν ℵA syr.sin lat.vt (codd.).

19. *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*] i.e. the mightier one who was to come after him, iii. 16. Yet the words and deeds of Jesus which his disciples would relate are not suggestive of the awful figure whose advent John had foreshadowed.

21. This verse (not in Mt.) is very awkwardly interpolated by Lk. in order that full meaning may be given to *ἃ εἴδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε* in the verse following.

22. The messengers are to tell John of the miracles which fulfil the Messianic prophecies. The preceding verse makes it clear that Lk. understands 'the blind receive their sight,' etc., literally. The same is the case in Mt., for he has placed Marcan miracles before this incident to answer to the words of the message. But perhaps this was not intended in Q. The words are derived from Is. lxi. 1 combined with xxxv. 5 f. where they are figurative expressions for the bestowal of new life. Two of the clauses—the cleansing of the lepers and the raising of the dead—are not founded upon the Isaianic prophecies. In the Mandaean Book *Ginza* (*Right*, i. 201, p. 30, 3 f. = ii. 1. 136, p. 48, 7 f., ed. Lidzbarski) the same series of miracles (including those in the Gospels not derived from Isaiah) are found associated with the coming of the heavenly being Enos-Uthra. Reitzenstein (*Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung*, pp. 23 f.) has conjectured that Q is here dependent upon the Mandaean text and that the words of Jesus are to be explained against a background of beliefs preserved in the Mandaean texts. This is a bold conjecture, whatever view be adopted as to the date and provenance of the Mandaean literature.

23. This verse seems more appropriate if we suppose that John has sent to Jesus in the spirit of enquiry which leans to faith, than if we think of his message as the outcome of a doubt which has eclipsed faith.

*τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάνου Τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον*
*θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; ἀλλὰ τί* 25
*ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμένον;*
*ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς*
*βασιλείοις εἰσίν. ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; ναί,* 26
*λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου. οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ* 27
*γέγραπται*

> Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,
> ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

*λέγω ὑμῖν, μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν Ἰωάνου οὐδείς* 28
*ἔστιν· ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ*

28 *γυναικων*] add *προφητης* AD mult al f q vg syrr arm Clem Ambr ϛ : om ℵBLW al 1-131 565 157 a b c e aegg syr.hl-mg pal aeth Or

24-25. John is described in each case by contrasts. He was no shaking reed, and no soft courtier. The eulogy on John appears to have no close connexion in thought with the incident which has preceded it.

24. *τί ἐξήλθατε κτλ.*] "What went ye out into the wilderness to see? a reed . . . ?" Or we may place the question mark after *ἔρημον* and translate *τί* 'why,' and similarly with the questions which follow. The latter translation is necessary in Mt. where, in the parallel to *v.* 26 *infra*, the words *ἰδεῖν* and *προφήτην* occur in reverse order, and must be constructed together.

25. *οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ . . . ὑπάρχοντες*] Mt. *οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες*, which is plainly more original. *ἱματισμός*] Cf. ix. 29; Ac. xx. 33. *καὶ τρυφῇ*] In N.T. only here and 2 Pet. ii. 13. *ὑπάρχοντες*] Very freq. in Lk. in the sense of 'being.' Never in Mt., Mk. or Jo.

27. John is more than a prophet because he is the messenger who is to herald the arrival of the Messiah. The text of Mal. iii. 1 is again applied to John in Mk. i. 2, where it is found with the same variations from the LXX as here (*ἔμπροσθέν σου* om. Mk.). The Christian interpretation of the text depends on reading *σου* for *μου* after *πρὸ προσώπου*. In Malachi God sends the messenger, and the messenger prepares the way for God.

28. *οὐδείς ἐστι*] A Lucan improvement of the Semitic form of speech preserved in Mt. *οὐκ ἐγήγερται*.

*ὁ δὲ μικρότερος*] Comparative form with force of superlative, as often. Cf. Blass, § 11. 3.

The function of John has been to prepare for a new order. He who is least in the new order is greater than he. In Mt. this saying is followed by a version — obscurer and probably more original—of the saying which Lk. gives below, xvi. 16, *q.v.* The position of John in relation to the kingdom of God is here viewed from the standpoint of the historical order. *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ* virtually means 'within the society of the believers.' It seems very doubtful whether this usage would have been adopted by Jesus. It

29 ἐστίν.—Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν
30 τὸν θεόν, βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάνου· οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι
καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς
31 ἑαυτούς, μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.—Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ τίνι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι;
32 ὅμοιοί εἰσιν παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν
ἀλλήλοις, ἃ λέγει

Ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε·
ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε·

33 ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτιστὴς μὴ ἔσθων ἄρτον μήτε
34 πίνων οἶνον, καὶ λέγετε Δαιμόνιον ἔχει· ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς
τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔσθων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος

would be a clear perversion of the spirit of this passage as a whole to infer that Jesus thought that the Baptist would be excluded from the company of the patriarchs (cf. xiii. 28 *infra*) in the future kingdom.

29-30. These verses do not occur in the parallel in Mt. xi., though they find a counterpart in Mt. xxi. 31, 32, a saying of Jesus which follows the parable of the two sons. It is not at all clear here whether these verses are intended to be read as a historical statement introduced by the narrator: "When all the people and the publicans heard these words of Jesus, they justified God, while the Pharisees and lawyers who had not been baptized with John's baptism rejected the counsel of God." This seems to be the most satisfactory interpretation of the present text, although the return to direct speech in *v.* 31 without further introduction is awkward. The alternative is to make this verse one of the sayings of Jesus in which, as in Mt. xxi. 31, 32, Jesus contrasts the response of the outcast with the response of the Pharisees and lawyers. But this makes a very bald *logion* in this connexion, and the opening words πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας are very strongly against it. The passage was perhaps introduced here to provide an interpretation by anticipation of *v.* 35 *infra*. The people and the publicans are 'the children of wisdom,' who justify God by heeding each of the two messengers whom God has sent. In Mt. xxi. 32 we read οἱ δὲ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ.

30. νομικοί for γραμματεῖς, as often in Luke, cf. x. 25 n.

εἰς ἑαυτούς] The βουλή of God could not be itself frustrated. If some rejected it, others accepted it. So far as concerned themselves (εἰς ἑαυτούς) the Pharisees and lawyers rejected it.

31-32. The comparison is not exactly expressed. It is John and Jesus—not this generation—who are the counterparts to the children who invite their fellows to joy or to mourning—in each case without success.

33-34. ἐλήλυθεν . . . ἐλήλυθεν] ἦλθεν . . . ἦλθεν Mt. ἄρτον, οἶνον not in Mt., and probably added to Q by Lk. The omission of the words here by D syr.vt lat.vt

φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. καὶ 35
ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

35 παντων om D 1 etc al syr.vt arm

(codd.) is probably due to the influence of Mt.

35. The wisdom of God is justified by her own children, because they listen to God's messengers. The interpretation is easier if with D etc. we omit πάντων. But Lk. is inclined to insert πᾶς πάντες wherever possible. Mt. (in the best texts) gives the variant version ἔργων for τέκνων. It has never been satisfactorily explained and is perhaps a very early corruption or mistake (Wellh., Harnack).

## Jesus anointed by a Woman who was a Sinner (vii. 36-50)

There follows a scene which illustrates the character of the mission of Jesus as sketched in the preceding section. Jesus sits at meat in a Pharisee's house. A sinful woman lavishes affection upon him and receives from him a gracious pardon, whereas the host, who has already neglected his guest, disapproves the gentleness of Jesus to the erring woman.

This narrative is regarded by Luke as a variant to the story of the anointing in Mk. xiv. 3 f., for he has omitted the latter narrative from his version of the Passion (c. xxii.). Luke may draw upon some other source which contained a parallel to the Marcan anointing, or, less probably, he may himself have recast and filled in the Marcan story.

A further problem is presented by the relation of this narrative to the narrative of the anointing of Jesus by Mary, the sister of Lazarus, Jo. xii. 1 f. John depends mainly on Mark, and, like Mark, he places the anointing in relation to the approaching Passion (cf. John xii. 7 with Mk. xiv. 8), although, unlike Mark, he dates the incident before the triumphal entry. But there are also points of contact between the Johannine version and this Lucan narrative, see *v.* 38 n. These are probably to be explained by dependence of John upon Luke.

The scene in Luke, like many of the scenes peculiar to this evangelist, is at once impressive in its total effect, and in detail lacking in verisimilitude. The behaviour of the Pharisee who first invites Jesus to his table and then, for some reason unexplained, neglects the ordinary duties of hospitality is unconvincing. And the rebuke of Jesus to his host, if treated realistically, is equally unsatisfactory. The real intention of *vv.* 44-47 is to point the broad contrast between the response of the sinner and the response of the Pharisee to the divine teacher.

It remains to note a more serious inconsistency of thought in the narrative as it stands. The moral of the story of the anointing is very plain: the woman anointed Jesus because she loved. Her love covers her many sins, and on the ground of her love (*v.* 47) or her faith (*v.* 50) she receives forgiveness. On the other hand the parable of the two debtors, which Jesus propounds in answer to the unspoken reproaches of his host, teaches a different lesson. Here the love is not, as in the narrative, the *condition* of the forgiveness, but its *consequence*. He to whom little is forgiven loves little; he to whom much is forgiven loves much. The two discrepant lines of thought run against one another in the false antithesis of *v.* 47.

36 Ἠρώτα δέ τις αὐτὸν τῶν Φαρισαίων ἵνα φάγῃ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ·
37 καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Φαρισαίου κατεκλίθη. Καὶ
ἰδοὺ γυνὴ ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἁμαρτωλός, καὶ ἐπιγνοῦσα ὅτι
κατάκειται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Φαρισαίου, κομίσασα ἀλάβαστρον
38 μύρου καὶ στᾶσα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα,
τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς
θριξὶν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασσεν, καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς
39 πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος
ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων Οὗτος εἰ ἦν [ὁ]
προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ ἥτις

39 προφητης] praem ο BΞ

36. The Son of Man is come eating and drinking (*v.* 34). It is natural, therefore, to find him at a social festivity. κατεκλίθη] The diners would recline on divans. It would thus be possible for the woman to approach him and kiss his feet from behind.

37. γυνή] There is no clue to the name or identity of the woman either here or in Mark. The tradition of the Western Church from Gregory the Great which identifies her with Mary Magdalene has no ground of support in the narrative. In John, Jesus is sitting at meat in the house of Lazarus and is anointed by Mary, the sister of Martha and Lazarus.

38. Conscious of her weakness and sin, the woman approaches Jesus, lets her tears fall upon his feet, and then wipes them off with her hair. It is only in Lk. that the woman is a sinner (a characteristic Lucan *motif*), and it is only in Lk. that she weeps and wipes away her tears. In Mk. the woman anoints the *head* of Jesus. Here the woman anoints his feet. John takes over from Luke the anointing of the *feet*, and—not very appropriately, since he records no tears—her drying them with her hair. The verbal resemblances between Luke and John can scarcely be accidental. Jo. xii. 3 ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαξεν ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

39. [ὁ] προφήτης] The article would mean 'the prophet,' cf. Deut. xviii. 15, as in Ac. iii. 22, Jo. i. 21, etc. But the article is probably interpolation. The observation is general: a prophet should be able

ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ 40
Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Σίμων, ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν. ὁ
δέ Διδάσκαλε, εἰπέ, φησίν. δύο χρεοφιλέται ἦσαν δανιστῇ 41
τινί· ὁ εἷς ὤφειλεν δηνάρια πεντακόσια, ὁ δὲ
ἕτερος πεντήκοντα. μὴ ἐχόντων αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦναι ἀμφοτέροις 42
ἐχαρίσατο. τίς οὖν αὐτῶν πλεῖον ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν;
ἀποκριθεὶς Σίμων εἶπεν Ὑπολαμβάνω ὅτι ᾧ τὸ πλεῖον 43
ἐχαρίσατο. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ὀρθῶς ἔκρινας. καὶ στραφεὶς 44
πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη Βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν
γυναῖκα; εἰσῆλθόν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὕδωρ μοι ἐπὶ πόδας
οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας
καὶ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν. φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· 45
αὕτη δὲ ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς
πόδας. ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλήν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας· αὕτη δὲ μύρῳ 46
ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας μου. οὗ χάριν λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αἱ 47
ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ πολλαί, ὅτι ἠγάπησεν πολύ· ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον

47 *αι αμαρτιαι αυτης αι πολλαι*] *αυτη πολλα* D ff$^2$ l   *οτι ηγαπησεν . . . αγαπα* om D : *οτι ηγαπησεν πολυ* om e

to discern the character of those with whom he consorts.

40. Σίμων] We have not before been told the host's name. It is the same as that of the leper host in Mark xiv.

40-43. The Pharisee had assumed in his silent criticism that sin should and must debar the sinner from relations with God and with godly men. The parable counters the assumption by the principle that the forgiveness of a great debt will engender a proportionate love.

44-47. If we interpret these verses on the basis of the preceding parable, the woman's great love is a proof that much has already been forgiven her. It is possible, though not entirely easy, to carry this interpretation through *v.* 47: "Since (ὅτι) she loved much, it follows that many sins have been forgiven her." The easier rendering is "her sins have been forgiven her, on account of, or on the ground of, her great love." And this rendering is supported by the end of the incident, when Jesus pronounces a concluding absolution upon the woman.

The reading of D in *v.* 47 avoids the awkward antithesis by omitting the second clause. But it is unlikely that *v.* 47b is less original than the parable of the two debtors. Wellh. thinks that D gives the true reading in the first half of the sentence. αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ πολλαί he holds to be an awkward substitute for αὐτῇ πολλά, which originated in a purist objection to the neuter plural as subject to a plural verb.

The contrast between Simon and the woman in *vv.* 44-46 must not be too closely pressed. The idea is that the woman by her loving attentions has made amends for breaches in the

48 ἀφίεται, ὀλίγον ἀγαπᾷ. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῇ Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ
49 ἁμαρτίαι. καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ συνανακείμενοι λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
50 Τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃς καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἀφίησιν; εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὴν
γυναῖκα Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.

ordinary social etiquette of which the host has been guilty. But the contrast fails to carry forward the thought of the preceding parable, since, had Simon given the water, the kiss and the oil, they would testify to his courtesy as host, but not to love, either great or small.

48. Cf. *v.* 21 *supra* = Mk. ii. 6.

50. *ἡ πίστις σου . . . εἰρήνην*] An exact equivalent to viii. 48 = Mk. v. 34. But in the latter case faith has operated to 'save' the woman from her disease. Here faith is used, as in Paul, of the human response which appropriates forgiveness of sin.

## A WANDERING MINISTRY (viii. 1-ix. 50)

Luke now passes to a new chapter. Jesus enters upon a period of wandering in which, accompanied by the Twelve, he preaches the Kingdom of God. Luke here resumes his Marcan source, upon which he continues to found his narrative, until the beginning of the journey to Jerusalem (ix. 51). Except for one lengthy omission (Mk. vi. 45-viii. 26) after ix. 17, and two shorter omissions (Mk. vi. 1-6, the visit to Nazareth, and Mk. vi. 17-29, the execution of John the Baptist), the Marcan material is reproduced with relatively slight abbreviations, transpositions and modifications. Luke has prefixed a brief introduction to this section, in which he indicates the manner of life of Jesus and his apostles. They are accompanied by certain well-to-do women, who provide for the needs of the band of preachers. We learn almost accidentally in Mark's narrative of the Crucifixion (xv. 40-41) that Jesus and his disciples had been accompanied on their journey to Jerusalem by women who had "followed him and served him when he was in Galilee." In his account of the Crucifixion Luke also refers to the presence of the women, but he has not there (xxiii. 49) reproduced the further details about the women from Mark, no doubt because he has already recorded them in this place. The Lucan list of names differs from the Marcan. Mary Magdalene is common to both lists. Joanna is not in Mark, but reappears in Lk. xxiv. 10. Susanna is mentioned here alone. Both Mark (xv. 41) and Luke (viii. 3) indicate that there were other women besides those whom they name.

VIII. 1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς καὶ αὐτὸς διώδευεν κατὰ πόλιν

1-3. There are many characteristic marks of Luke's style. For the constr. *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ . . . καὶ αὐτός . . .* cf. i. 8 n. *καθεξῆς*, *διοδεύειν* (in N.T. only here and Ac. xvii. 1), *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, *ἀσθένεια* are

*καὶ κώμην κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ*
*θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ δώδεκα σὺν αὐτῷ, καὶ γυναῖκές τινες αἳ ἦσαν* 2
*τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν,*
*Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή, ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ*
*ἐξεληλύθει, καὶ Ἰωάνα γυνὴ Χουζᾶ ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρῴδου καὶ* 3
*Σουσάννα καὶ ἕτεραι πολλαί, αἵτινες διηκόνουν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν*
*ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς.*

Lucan words. *ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς*] Cf. vii. 11.

2. *ἀφ' ἧς ἐξεληλύθει*] Prob. the original of [Mk.] xvi. 9 *παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια.*

3. *γυνὴ Χουζᾶ*] She was therefore likely to be a woman of substance. Acts xiii. 1 refers to another member of the Herodian household. *Χουζᾶ(ς)* —כּוּזָא. The name is found in a Nabatean inscr., *CIS.* 227.

*καὶ ἕτεραι πολλαί, αἵτινες διηκόνουν αὐτοῖς*] Mk. xv. 41 *αἳ ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ, καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ . . .*

### THE SOWER AND HIS SEED: A PARABLE OF THE WORD OF GOD. AN INCIDENT WHICH SHEWS THAT THOSE WHO HEAR AND DO THE WORD OF GOD ARE THE TRUE KINSFOLK OF JESUS (viii. 4-21).

Luke has made use of non-Marcan material since the account of the call of the twelve and the healing of the diseased (vi. 12-19) which preceded the Great Sermon. In Mark the call of the Twelve is followed by

(1) the statement that his family came out to take him since he was thought to be out of his mind (iii. 20-21);

(2) the dispute concerning casting out devils by Beelzebub (iii. 22-30);

(3) the arrival of his mother and brethren and the sayings of Jesus consequent thereon (iii. 31-35);

(4) the parable of the sower and its interpretation with other sayings and parables (iv. 1-34).

Luke omits (2) because he is to introduce another version of the same narrative at a later stage (xi. 14 f.). He omits (1), perhaps because it was not entirely to his taste. (The narrative seems scarcely to harmonise with the picture of Mary in cc. i.-ii.) (3) is deferred until after the parable of the sower and the other sayings, where the story, especially as told by Luke, serves to clinch the teaching of the parable. The parable of the sower stands well at the opening of the new section.

After the conclusion of the sayings reproduced in Lk. viii. 16-18 there follow in Mark the parables of the seed growing secretly and of the mustard seed. The latter parable occurs later in the Gospel (xiii. 18-19 from Q) where it forms a pair with the parable of the leaven. Naturally, therefore, it is omitted here in accordance with Luke's practice elsewhere. The omission of the parable of the seed growing secretly is less easy to explain.

4 Συνιόντος δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπι-
5 πορευομένων πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν διὰ παραβολῆς Ἐξῆλθεν
ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐν τῷ
σπείρειν αὐτὸν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ κατ-
6 επατήθη καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν αὐτό. καὶ
ἕτερον κατέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, καὶ φυὲν ἐξηράνθη
7 διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα. καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐν μέσῳ
τῶν ἀκανθῶν, καὶ συνφυεῖσαι αἱ ἄκανθαι ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό.
8 καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθήν, καὶ φυὲν
ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα. Ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει

4-15. || Mk. iv. 1-20; Mt. xiii. 1-23.

4. In Mk. iv. 1 Jesus is forced by the crowd to enter a boat, from which he addresses the people. Lk. has already made use of this scene in v. 1, and he feels himself at liberty to modify the detail. The scene is in or near a *πόλις*, but is not further defined.

*συνιόντος . . . ἐπιπορευομένων*] Both of these compounds here only in N.T. *σύνειμι* (from *εἶμι*) good Greek from Homer downwards. *ἐπιπορεύεσθαι* Polyb., Plut., pap., LXX.

*εἶπεν διὰ παραβολῆς*] i.e. the parable of the sower, the one parable which Luke here records. Mk. *καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά.*

5. *τοῦ σπεῖραι*] The gen. of purpose (*τοῦ*) inserted by Lk. On this constr. cf. Moulton, *Prol.* p. 216. Lk. supplies two-thirds of the total number of exx. for the N.T.

*τὸν σπόρόν αὐτοῦ*] Add. Luc. Cf. *v.* 11.

*καὶ κατεπατήθη*] Add. Luc. The addition is not made use of in the interpretation, and the modification here, as in the next verse, does not improve the picture. The seed would not be more likely to fall to the birds if it had first been trampled down.

6. The Marcan description of what befell the seed which fell on stony ground is here greatly abbreviated, and the point is obscured, apparently because it was not understood. Here it is simply said that the seed had no moisture. But in Mark the seed springs up *quickly* because it had no depth of earth, and thus was not strong enough to stand the rays of the sun. But in the Lucan interpretation (*v.* 13) the Marcan form of the parable again emerges: *καὶ οὗτοι ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν.*

*φυέν*] In N.T. only here and *v.* 8, and Heb. xii. 15 (= Deut. xxix. 18 LXX).

*ἰκμάς*] Good Greek from Homer downwards. Plut., Lucian, etc., LXX Jer. xvii. 8. Here only in N.T.

7. *συνφυεῖσαι.* Here only in N.T. The thorns and the wheat grew up *at the same time.* So Vulg. *simul exortae.*

8. *ἐποίησεν καρπόν*] On this

Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω. Ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν 9
οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ παραβολή. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν 10
Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ,
τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα ΒΛΈΠΟΝΤΕϹ ΜῊ ΒΛΈΠωϹΙΝ ΚΑῚ
ἈΚΟΎΟΝΤΕϹ ΜῊ ϹΥΝΊωϹΙΝ. ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή. Ὁ 11

Semitism cf. iii. 8 n.; Introd. p. lxxxi. Mk. ἐδίδου καρπόν.

ἑκατονταπλασίονα] The different measures of increase given in Mk. disappear.

ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει] 'As he said this, he cried.' Mk. simply καὶ ἔλεγεν.

ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω] Both Mt. and Lk. substitute the part. ὁ ἔχων for ὃς ἔχει Mk. This solemn exclamation occurs twice in Mk.—iv. 9 (the original of this verse) and iv. 23 (om. Luc. *infra*, *v.* 17). Mt. also gives it after the declaration that John the Baptist is Elijah, xi. 15, and it occurs in Lk. xiv. 35. Also Rev. ii. iii. after each of the messages to the Churches, and Rev. xiii. 9. The last is the only passage where the saying is used by another than Christ.

9-10. Lk. has abbreviated and softened the Marcan dialogue on the purpose of the parables. In the first place Lk. confines the question to the particular case of the parable of the sower: τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ παραβολή, cf. *supra v.* 4. Contrast Mk. ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολάς. Lk. does not state (like Mk.) that the question was put to Jesus in private, and this omission weakens the impression of an esoteric communication. But the idea that the parabolic teaching was a riddle to those who had not been granted the power to understand is retained, though in a less emphatic form. τοῖς λοιποῖς is weaker than ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω in Mk., and the harsh concluding verse of the prophecy from Is. vi—μή ποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς—is left out. On the interpretation of the Marcan text and its relation to the parables of Jesus reference should be made above all to Jülicher's great work *Gleichnisreden Jesu*. The texts are discussed by Rawlinson, *St. Mark* pp. 46 f., and B. T. D. Smith on Mt. xiii. p. 135, who both accept Jülicher's main contention, viz. that the parables which were originally illustrations came to be regarded as mysterious allegories which were intelligible only to the elect. One great difficulty in regarding Mk. iv. 10, 12 as historical is that it requires παραβολή to be used in two different senses (cf. Smith *l.c.*). Contrast Mk. iv. 11 ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται with Mk. iv. 33 καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν.

εἴη] Optat. in indirect question, as often in Lk.

10. ὑμῖν δέδοται . . . τοῦ θεοῦ] Lk. agrees with Mt. against Mk. in inserting γνῶναι and reading μυστήρια in the plural (but C k syr.sin Clem Iren read μυστήριον in Mt. and this may be the true reading). γνῶναι is an interpretative insertion, which might well have been made independently by two writers.

11. ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή] The difficult Marcan verse 13, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παρα-

12 *σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν εἰσιν*
*οἱ ἀκούσαντες, εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον*
13 *ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν. οἱ*
*δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται*
*τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὗτοι ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οἳ πρὸς καιρὸν*
14 *πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται. τὸ δὲ*
*εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ*
*μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευόμενοι συν-*
15 *πνίγονται καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν. τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ,*

*βολὴν ταύτην, καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;* is omitted. It appears to conflict with the point of view of the preceding verses, *ὑμῖν δέδοται κτλ.*, and it implies a reproof to the apostles which Lk. would be glad to omit. We pass at once to the interpretation of the one parable, which in Luke has alone been the subject of enquiry.

*ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*] The seed is the word of God, yet the seed sown can be compared to the recipients of the word. There is here, as in Mark, a certain very natural confusion in the thought, if it is pressed. *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* to Luke and his readers would no doubt suggest the Christian preaching of salvation. *τοῦ θεοῦ* is not in Mark, with the consequence that *ὁ λόγος* has a more general meaning: 'the teaching.'

12. *ὁ διάβολος*] Mk. *Σατανᾶς*. Lk. uses *Σατανᾶς* elsewhere, as well as *διάβολος*. *διάβολος* is not found in Mk.

*καὶ αἴρει . . . σωθῶσιν*] Lk. gives a conventionalised version of Mk. *ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν* replaces *τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς*, and the quasi-technical phrase of Christian piety *μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν* is added.

13. *ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσι*] Lk. has only mentioned the want of root above (see *v.* 6 n.), but here the Marcan original is retained.

*πιστεύουσι . . . πειρασμοῦ*] Again Lk. introduces the ordinary terminology of the Church. Mk. *πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν, εἶτα γενομένης θλίψεώς ἢ διωγμοῦ . . .*

*ἀφίστανται*] Lucan. Mk. *σκανδαλίζονται.*

14. *ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου*] For Mk. *αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι* (om. D al.), an awkward phrase which Mt. has omitted. Both words *ἡδονή* and *βίος* find parallels in the later epistles. *ἡδονή* not elsewhere in Gospels or in Paul, but in Tit. iii. 3; Ja. iv. 1, 3; 2 Pet. ii. 13. *βίος*, apart from this passage, occurs in the Gospels only in the sense of 'livelihood,' Mk. xii. 44 (= Lk. xxi. 4); Lk. xv. 12, 30. For the usage of *βίος* in this verse with the connotation of 'life in the world' cf. 2 Ti. ii. 4; 1 Jo. ii. 16, iii. 17.

*πορευόμενοι*] 'go on their way and . . .' Cf. 2 Regn. iii. 1. But there is almost certainly a reminiscence of Mk., who says that the cares of the age, the deceit of riches and desires for other things *εἰσπορευόμεναι συνπνίγουσι τὸν λόγον.*

*οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν*] 'bring no fruit to perfection.' Here only in N.T. Good Gk. Theophr., also 4 Macc. xiii. 20. Mk. *ἄκαρπος γίνεται.*

οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκούσαντες τὸν
λόγον κατέχουσιν καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἅψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω 16
κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευό-
μενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς. οὐ γάρ ἔστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν 17
γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερὸν
ἔλθῃ. Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε· ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ, δοθήσεται 18

15. ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ] Add. Luc. The familiar classical Greek collocation—καλοκἀγαθία—is a striking example of Hellenistic influence upon a Gospel text.

κατέχουσι] 'retain it.' κατέχειν Lucan only in Gospels. Mk. παραδέχονται.

ἐν ὑπομονῇ] Lk. again omits from Mk. the varying yields of increase, ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ [ἐν] ἑξήκοντα καὶ [ἐν] ἕκατον, and substitutes the idea familiar in the early Church 'in patience.' ὑπομονή frequent in St. Paul. Also Heb., Ja., 2 Pet. In Gospels only here and *infra* xxi. 19.

16. λύχνον ἅψας] By the light we should probably understand the preaching of the word, which should be set on high like a light for all to behold. But this is a different conception from that of *v.* 10 *supra*. Cf. Wellh. on Mk. iv. 21. Lk. has improved the Marcan sentence (μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα . . . τεθῇ) by making it an affirmative statement: οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἅψας καλύπτει . . . ἢ τίθησιν. He has also added the last clause: ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι . . . τὸ φῶς. By 'those who enter' we may perhaps understand the Gentile converts. But Lk. appears to have in mind another version of the saying, since the form as here given is in essential agreement with that found later, xi. 33. ὑποκάτω κλίνης alone reproduces Mk. iv. 21 ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, and is not represented in xi. 33.

17. All that is hidden shall be brought to the light and made known. Lk. follows Mk. in connecting this saying with the preceding by γάρ, but probably it was originally a separate saying (so Wellh.). It occurs again below, xii. 2 (= Mt. x. 26), where see note. Lk. omits here from Mk. the cry 'If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear.'

18. βλέπετε οὖν πῶς . . . ] 'see then how ye hear.' By substituting πῶς ἀκούετε for τί ἀκούετε (Mk.) Lk. gives a somewhat different turn to the injunction. He has connected it with the following saying: ὃς ἂν γάρ κτλ. The thought in Lk. appears to be: "Take heed how you hear: he who hears the word profitably will profit yet more; he who hears carelessly will lose even what he seems to have." In Mk., however, the two sayings are divided by another saying which Lk. has already given (vi. 38b) and which he here omits: ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. The connexion in Mk. between this saying and the preceding βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε is obscure. The saying ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ κτλ. reappears in the parable of the pounds, xix. 26 (= Mt. xxv. 29). Lk. has attenuated the paradoxical form of the saying in his Marcan source, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, by reading ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν.

At this point Lk. omits the parables of the seed growing secretly

αὐτῷ, καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ'
αὐτοῦ.
19 Παρεγένετο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. ἀπηγγέλη
20 δὲ αὐτῷ Ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἑστήκασιν
21 ἔξω ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς
Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ
θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.
22 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη εἰς πλοῖον

and the mustard seed, and also the Marcan conclusion to the section on parables (*vv.* 33, 34): "With many such parables he spake the word to them, as they were able to hear, and without a parable he spake not to them, but privately to his own disciples he expounded all." Perhaps Lk. was conscious of a discrepancy between the former and the latter half of this Marcan text, of which the former suggests that the parables were spoken in order to be suitable to the capabilities of those who listened, while the latter recalls the doctrine of Mk. iv. 11, 12 that the parables were a mystery whose meaning was only unveiled to the chosen few. In place of the Marcan conclusion we pass to the incident of the visit of Jesus' mother and brethren.

19-21. By the omission of Mk. iii. 20-21 no motive is assigned for this visit. We may, if we will, suppose that they merely came to enquire after his welfare. The Marcan account is also otherwise abbreviated. The question 'Who is my mother and who are my brethren?' is left out. The Lucan narrative thus at the least lessens the impression of disharmony between Jesus and his relatives. It is not indeed said or here implied that his relatives belong to the class of those who 'hear the word of God and do it,' but the rôle of the kinsfolk, as Luke tells the story, is rather to provide an occasion for the saying concerning the spiritual kinsfolk than to suggest—as Mark does suggest—a contrast between natural and spiritual relationships.

19. συντυχεῖν] Here only in N.T.

διὰ τὸν ὄχλον] The whole situation is vaguely conceived. There was a great multitude present (*v.* 4) when the parable of the sower was spoken. We are not definitely told but are probably intended to infer that the question of the disciples (*v.* 9) was put to him in private. Here again the multitude surrounds him.

21. The concluding saying has been recast. Mk. iii. 35 Ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου· ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν. By translating this into terms of 'hearing and doing the word of God' Luke relates the incident to the parable of the sower and its interpretation, and thus makes it close the paragraph.

22. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καί] ‖ Mk. iv. 35-41; Mt. viii. 23-27. In Mk. this story is closely connected in time with the parables which precede. Jesus is still in the ship from which he spoke the parable of the sower, and "on that day, when

καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Διέλθωμεν
εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης, καὶ ἀνήχθησαν. πλεόντων δὲ 23
αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσεν. καὶ κατέβη λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου εἰς τὴν
λίμνην, καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνευον. προσελθόντες 24
δὲ διήγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύ-
μεθα· ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι
τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ ἐπαύσαντο, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη. εἶπεν δὲ 25
αὐτοῖς Ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν,

evening was come, he says to his disciples, Let us cross . . .," and they "take him as he was in the boat." But the connexion in Mark is probably secondary and literary. Verses 35-36 of Mk. iv. would read better without ὡς ἦν in *v.* 36. Jesus would then make the proposal to cross the sea while still on land, and then the disciples would take him in the boat. The supposed insertion thus makes a connexion with iv. 1; it also reinforces the difficulty of understanding how the disciples privately questioned Jesus about the parable of the sower while he was still in the boat (iv. 10). Lk. and Mt. both ignore the Marcan connexion. In Lk. the parable of the sower is not spoken by the seaside. Here we make a fresh start: "On one of those days he embarked on a ship with his disciples."

τῆς λίμνης] To the Gentile Luke the sea of Galilee is not a θάλασσα but λίμνη. λίμνη, apart from Rev., Lucan only in N.T.

ἀνήχθησαν] ἀνάγω 13 times in Acts. Elsewhere in N.T. here only.

23. πλεόντων] Rev. xviii. 17. Otherwise only Lucan (4 times in Acts). ἀφύπνωσεν] Here only in N.T. Lk. transposes the Marcan order and mentions the sleep of Jesus before the storm. He does not reproduce from Mk. that Jesus slept in the prow and on a cushion.

κατέβη λαῖλαψ] A sudden squall is liable to burst upon the sea of Galilee from the surrounding hills and gorges.

καὶ ἐκινδύνευον] Lucan. Acts xix. 27, 40. Elsewhere in N.T. only 1 Cor. xv. 30.

24. ἐπιστάτα] Cf. v. 5 n. Here it replaces διδάσκαλε (Mk.). ἀπολλύμεθα] The appeal is softer than the peremptory words in Mk.: οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; Mt. has made a similar change: Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα (viii. 25).

τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι] The wind and the wave are regarded as quasi-personal powers which, like the devils, yield to the Master's powerful word.

Wellh. thinks that τῇ θαλάσσῃ (placed by D in a slightly different position) is not original in Mk. The wind is the demonic force which plays upon the passive water. But both Mt. and Lk. make Jesus address the sea as well as the wind, and this is in favour of retaining the word in Mk.

κλύδωνι] In N.T. here and in Ja. i. 6; Greek poetry from Homer downwards, and later prose, LXX.

25. ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;] Gentler than the rebuke in Mk. τί δειλοὶ ἐστε; οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν;

φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν] A slight agreement with Mt. (οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες) against

λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ τοῖς
ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;
26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν,
27 ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντίπερα τῆς Γαλιλαίας. ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ
τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν ἀνήρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔχων δαιμόνια·
καὶ χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ
28 ἔμενεν ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας

26 Γερασηνων BC*D latt syr.hl-mg sah : Γεργεσηνων ℵLXΘΞ 1 etc 33 157 700 pal boh arm : Γαδαρηνων A mult al syr ϛ

Mk. (*καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν μέγαν φόβον*). Loisy's suggestion that Mt. and Lk. may have used in common both Mk. and the source of Mk. seems unnecessary. Mark's phrase is awkward and called for amendment. The agreement may well be accidental.

26-39. || Mk. v. 1-20; Mt. viii. 28-34. *The Gerasene Demoniac.* This is a strange story. Jesus frees a possessed man from a multitude of devils, which forthwith take up their abode in a herd of swine. The swine hurl the devils and themselves to destruction in the lake. It is not profitable to attempt rationalising versions as to what may have occurred. The story was related by people to whom belief in possession by evil spirits was assumed as a matter of course. Possibly it was a popular tale which in some way that cannot now be recovered came to be attached to Jesus (cf. Bultmann, p. 129).

26. *καὶ κατέπλευσαν*] Lk. again uses a good (not a technical) nautical word. Here only in N.T. Mk. *ἦλθον*.

*τῶν Γερασηνῶν*] The combination of B with D latt is in favour of the reading *Γερασηνῶν* here. In Mk. *Γερασηνῶν* is read by ℵBD latt. *Γαδαρηνῶν* is the best attested reading in Mt. The Western text has assimilated the texts of the different Gospels by introducing *Γερασηνῶν* in Mt. Similarly syr.vt and the Byz. text have assimilated Lk. to Mt. *Γεργεσηνῶν* is strongly attested for Lk. (less strongly for Mk., where, however, it is given by syr.sin). *Γεργεσηνῶν* is probably an Alexandrine correction, perhaps by Origen, intended to rectify the geography. Cf. Orig. *In Joann.* tom. vi. 41. Origen rejects Gerasa and Gadara as geographically impossible, and gives reasons from geography and mystical etymology for accepting Gergesa. *Γέργεσα, ἀφ' ἧς οἱ Γεργεσαῖοι πόλις ἀρχαία περὶ τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Τιβερίαδα λίμνην.* It remains obscure what locality was intended. Gadara is eight miles to the south of the lake, Gerasa was two days' journey away on the edge of the desert. Sanday and others conjecture that the place referred to was the modern *Kersa* on the E. side of the lake opposite Magdala.

*ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντίπερα τῆς Γαλιλαίας*] Geographically more precise than Mk. *εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης.* Cf. iv. 31.

27. *ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ*] A neat use of the participle in place of the awkward gen. absol. in Mk. followed by the dat.: *ἐξελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτῷ.*

28 f. Lk. has here greatly reduced the redundancies of Mk.'s narrative, and at the same time added the statements that the man

προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ
σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ [τοῦ θεοῦ] τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαί σου, μή
με βασανίσῃς· παρήγγελλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ 29
ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάκει
αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδεσμεύετο ἁλύσεσιν καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος,
καὶ διαρήσσων τὰ δεσμὰ ἠλαύνετο ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου
εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους. ἐπηρώτησεν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί σοὶ 30
ὄνομά ἐστιν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Λεγιών, ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια
πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ 31
αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν. Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων 32
ἱκανῶν βοσκομένη ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα
ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς.
ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθον εἰς 33
τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν
λίμνην καὶ ἀπεπνίγη. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ γεγονὸς 34
ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς.
ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ἦλθαν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ 35
εὗραν καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν
ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ,

28 *του θεου* om DΞ 1 g l

had for long been unclothed (inferred from *ἱματισμένον* below, Mk. v. 15 = Lk. *v.* 35) and that 'he dwelt in no house.' That he had often been bound and had broken his chains is transferred by Lk.—rather awkwardly—to follow the first address of Jesus to the possessed man.

28. *καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν*] It is the devil who speaks through the man, as is shewn both by the words *μή με βασανίσῃς*, 'torment me not,' and by the explanatory words which follow, *παρήγγελλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ*.

30. *τί σοὶ ὄνομά ἐστι;*] The knowledge of the demon's name would, according to ancient belief, give the exorcist an advantage over the demon. Bultmann (p. 130) is disposed to conjecture that in an earlier form of the story the devil may have been compelled by some device to disclose his name, and that this feature was suppressed when the story was told of Jesus. Wellhausen thinks that the point of the devil's reply may be that he refuses to give his name, and gives his number instead.

31. *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*] i.e. into the abyss of hell, to which the devils will be consigned at the last judgement. This is Lk.'s version for Mk.'s more naïve expression: *ἔξω τῆς χώρας*.

32. *ἀγέλη χοίρων*] The owners therefore were not Jews. The population on the further side of Jordan and the sea of Galilee was largely heathen.

36 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἐσώθη
37 ὁ δαιμονισθείς. καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς
περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι φόβῳ
μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν.
38 ἐδεῖτο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια εἶναι
39 σὺν αὐτῷ· ἀπέλυσεν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγων Ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν
οἶκόν σου, καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν
καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
40 Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ
41 ὄχλος, ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν. Καὶ ἰδοὺ
ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰάειρος, καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς
ὑπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει
42 αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι θυγάτηρ
μονογενὴς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκεν.

37. Lk. characteristically makes the petitioners to be 'the whole multitude of the neighbourhood,' and characteristically adds the explanation of their petition ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο.

39. ὁ θεός] So Lk. interprets ὁ κύριος of Mk.—no doubt correctly.

καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν] The city is not named. It is, according to Mk. and Lk., some place near the lake in the country of the Gerasenes. Mk. here says that the man published his news abroad in Decapolis. Decapolis is nowhere mentioned in Lk.

40-56. *The healing of the woman with the issue of blood: the raising of Jairus's daughter.* || Mk. v. 21-43; Mt. ix. 18-26. This is the only case in the Gospels in which the accounts of two separate miracles are woven into one another. The obvious explanation may well be the true explanation, that so it happened. The woman with the issue of blood was healed as Jesus was on the way to the house of Jairus. So K. L. Schmidt, *R.G.J.* p. 148. On the other hand, Mk. iii. 20-35 and Mk. vi. 7-30 may be cited as partial parallels for the combination of sections, where the explanation is probably literary rather than historical.

40. ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰ.] Jesus now returns to the W. shore whence he had set out. So Lk. correctly interprets the Marcan text as it stands: καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Schmidt urges that τὸ πέραν elsewhere in the Gospels and πέραν in LXX describes the country E. of the sea and of Jordan. He holds that the present connexion of the narratives is artificial, and that the raising of Jairus's daughter took place E. of the sea—possibly at Bethsaida at the N.E. corner of the lake after Jesus had crossed from the western shore.

41. οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν] ὑπάρχω, 'to be,' Luke, Paul. Not in the other Gospels. Mk. here has εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων.

παρεκάλει . . . εἰσελθεῖν] Lk. transposes the direct speech of Mk. into indirect.

42. μονογενὴς . . . δώδεκα] That

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπνιγον αὐτόν. καὶ 43
γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἥτις οὐκ
ἴσχυσεν ἀπ᾿ οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι, προσελθοῦσα ὄπισθεν 44
ἥψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, καὶ παραχρῆμα
ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τίς 45
ὁ ἁψάμενός μου; ἀρνουμένων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος
Ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν. ὁ δὲ 46
Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Ἥψατό μού τις, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων δύναμιν
ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ᾿ ἐμοῦ. ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν 47
τρέμουσα ἦλθεν καὶ προσπεσοῦσα αὐτῷ δι᾿ ἣν αἰτίαν ἥψατο
αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἰάθη
παραχρῆμα. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου 48
σέσωκέν σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην. Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος 49
ἔρχεταί τις παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγων ὅτι Τέθνηκεν

43 *ητις*] add *ιατροις προσαναλωσασα ολον τον βιον* codd paene omnes: om BD syr.sin sah boh$^{\text{codd}}$ arm 44 *του κρασπεδου* fortasse ex Matt ix. 20; cf. Mk v. 27: om. D a ff$^2$ l 45 *ο Πετρος*] add *και οι συν αυτω* vel *και οι μετ αυτου* codd paene omnes: om BΠ 700 al pauc syrr(sin.cur) pal sah

the child was an only child is added by Lk. The statement that she was twelve years of age is made by Mk. at the end of the narrative and transferred to the beginning by Luke.

*καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκεν*] Substituted by Lk. for the Marcan vulgarism *ἐσχάτως ἔχει* condemned by Phrynichus ccclxviii.

43. According to the reading BD syr.sin Lk. omits from Mk. the statement that the woman had expended all her livelihood upon physicians without profit. If the writer is Luke the physician, it is natural that he should do so.

44. According to the reading of the best texts Mt. and Lk. agree here against Mk. in adding the word *τοῦ κρασπέδου*. This may be accidental, or, more probably, we should omit the word in Lk. with D etc.

45. *ἀρνουμένων δὲ πάντων*] Add. Luc.

*εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος*] Peter is the spokesman, as often. But in Mk. it is the disciples who speak. The addition *καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ* found in most MSS. is probably due to harmonising.

*οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε κτλ.*] This is more deferential than the brusque expostulation in Mk. *βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε, καὶ λέγεις, τίς μου ἥψατο;*

46. *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων*] Lk. has transposed what in Mk. is statement of fact into a direct statement by Jesus himself. Jesus is conscious that the woman has established contact with his own healing power.

47. *ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ*] Add. Luc. The woman must needs bear her testimony before the multitude.

49. *ἔρχεταί τις*] The only historic present which survives in the Marcan sections of Luke. Mk. *ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται.* Cf. Introd. p. lxii.

50 ἡ θυγάτηρ σου, μηκέτι σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
ἀκούσας ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευσον, καὶ
51 σωθήσεται. ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οὐκ ἀφῆκεν εἰσελθεῖν
τινὰ σὺν αὐτῷ εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ
52 τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα. ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες
καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Μὴ κλαίετε, οὐ γὰρ
53 ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει. καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ, εἰδότες ὅτι
54 ἀπέθανεν. αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν
55 λέγων Ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε. καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς,
καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα, καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν.
56 καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς
μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

54 η παις] iter Diat cf. vii. 14 supra

50. *καὶ σωθήσεται*] A Lucan addition which, however, is scarcely an improvement upon the terse answer as given in Mk.

51-54. Lk. has greatly abbreviated the narrative of Mk., and in so doing has obscured the story. In Mk. Jesus arrives at the house in company with Jairus and enters with the chosen three. In the house he finds the lamentation proceeding. He casts out the mourners, and then takes in the father and mother to the place where the child lies, and there raises the child. Lk. summarily says that Jesus allowed no one to enter the house except the three disciples and the father and the mother of the child. This makes a much less coherent story, for the mother has not been mentioned as having gone to meet Jesus, and it is more natural that she should have remained in the house, as Mk. implies. Lk. does not say that Jesus cast out the mourners, and he does not distinguish the second room where the child lay.

51. *Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ Ἰάκωβον*] Lk. changes the Marcan order of the names and places John before James. So again ix. 28, Ac. i. 13. This is perhaps significant. We may compare the close association of John with Peter in Acts iii. 1 f., iv. 13 f., viii. 14. James, on the other hand, precedes John in the list of the Twelve, vi. 14, and in v. 10, ix. 54.

53. *εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν*] This is a Lucan addition. It is more explicit than Mk., whose narrative, as it stands, is at least patient of the interpretation that the child was not really dead, even if that interpretation was not intended by the evangelist.

54. *ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε*] Lk. here, as elsewhere, avoids the Aramaic words reported by Mk.

55. *καὶ διέταξεν . . . φαγεῖν*] Lk. improves Mk.'s order by placing the command to give food to the child before the command to tell no man.

## THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE (ix. 1-6)

The preceding narratives of miraculous cures wrought by Jesus are followed in Mark by the account of the unsuccessful visit of Jesus to his native place

Nazareth, where his message is refused and his miraculous powers encounter unbelief. This Marcan section has already been utilised in Luke's fuller picture of the mission to Nazareth (*c.* iv.) and is therefore omitted here. Luke passes to the next Marcan section—the Mission of the Twelve—which he reproduces with small variations.

The missionaries are to travel without money, provision, or superfluous clothing. They are to accept hospitality at one house in a city, and there they are to remain until they leave that city. Those who refuse to receive them are to be left while the missionaries press on. The essential contents of the charge reappear in another version (Q) in *c.* x. (*The Charge to the Seventy*) where see introduction and notes. Perhaps Mark has abbreviated some longer version, such as that in Q.

The instructions reflect the mind of a community which lives in expectation of the near approach of the kingdom. They may certainly be taken as good evidence for the methods of early missions of the Palestinian Church. Whether they go back to an actual mission in the lifetime of Jesus, as the canonical Gospels represent, is a question which must be regarded as uncertain. "The section," says Wellhausen (*Evangelium Marci*, p. 44), "contains no historical tradition . . . the Twelve merely make an experiment and remain afterwards as lacking in independence and as passive as before, although the experiment succeeds. In truth Jesus instituted no experimental missionary journeys with his seminar. But as testimony for the nature of the oldest Christian mission in Palestine this instruction is of value." Bultmann (p. 87) takes a similar view: originally the speaker was the risen and exalted Lord. At the time of the composition of Mark's Gospel the instructions no longer suited in detail the conditions of the mission in the wider Gentile world, and in consequence they were thrown back into the period of the earthly life of Jesus, and converted into a chapter of history.

It may have been so. On the other hand there seems to be no conclusive reason why we should assume that Jesus did not at some period associate the Twelve with him in his work of preaching the advent of the kingdom, and the saying of Mark i. 17 (cf. Luke v. 10) may be taken to support the supposition that he did.

*Συνκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν* 1 IX.
*καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν,*

1-2. Lk. does not repeat from Mk. that the missionaries went out two by two.

1. *ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια*] More comprehensive than Mk. *τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων* and characteristic

2 *καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ*
3 *ἰᾶσθαι, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς* Μηδὲν *αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν,*
*μήτε ῥάβδον μήτε πήραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀργύριον, μήτε δύο*
4 *χιτῶνας ἔχειν. καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθητε, ἐκεῖ μένετε*
5 *καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε. καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς,*
*ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν*
6 *ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς.* Ἐξερχόμενοι
*δὲ διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ*
*θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ.*

of Lk. The healing of sick is recorded by Lk. as by Mk. at the close of the narrative, and a corresponding commission to heal is prefixed by Lk. to the charge. The express statement of the purpose of the mission—*κηρύσσειν τ. β. τ. θ. καὶ ἰᾶσθαι*—is added by Lk.

3. *μήτε ῥάβδον*] Lk. agrees with Mt. x. 10 against Mk. (*εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον*) in forbidding a staff, and the Marcan instruction to wear sandals is here omitted. *ὑποδήματα* are forbidden in Mt. x. 10 = Lk. x. 4.

*μηδὲν αἴρετε . . . μήτε ἔχειν*] An awkward change in construction which is taken over from Mk.: *ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν . . . καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι.*

4. *καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν*] Mk. here makes a fresh start with *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, possibly an indication that he is passing to a fresh part of his source. Lk. omits.

5. Cf. x. 10 n.

6. *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*] Lucan. Mk. *ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν.*

*πανταχοῦ*] Lk. adds an adverb with a universalising force. Cf. v. 1 *et passim.*

## The Perplexity of Herod Antipas (ix. 7-9)

Luke follows Mark in introducing an account of Herod's enquiries and surmises about Jesus, which makes the required literary break between the mission and the return of the Twelve. In Mark the conclusion of Herod that Jesus was John, whom he had beheaded, risen from the dead, provides an occasion for the narrative of the death of John the Baptist. This Luke omits. He nowhere records the death of the Baptist, only leaving it to be inferred from the words of Herod: "John I beheaded." The imprisonment of John has been recorded in *c.* iii.

The mention of Herod's enquiries in Mark is not made to bear directly upon the narrative, though shortly afterwards (vi. 45) Jesus crosses over to Bethsaida with his disciples, and a little later, after a return to Gennesaret (vi. 53), he sets out on journeys (vii. 24) outside Palestine and the area of Herod's jurisdiction. A connexion between Herod's activities and the withdrawal of Jesus may have been contained in Mark's source, and may have been suppressed, partly perhaps owing to reluctance to represent Jesus as yielding to threats of the tetrarch. The activities of Herod and the departure of Jesus are again brought into connexion below, xiii. 31 f. The latter passage may have been a variant version of some lost continuation of this present section which has disappeared from Mark and from the parallels which depend on Mark. In Lk. xiii. 31 f. there is a manifest concern to explain that in leaving Herod's territory Jesus did not yield to threats from Antipas.

*Ἤκουσεν δὲ Ἡρῴδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα,* 7
*καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὅτι Ἰωάνης ἠγέρθη*
*ἐκ νεκρῶν, ὑπὸ τινῶν δὲ ὅτι Ἠλείας ἐφάνη, ἄλλων δὲ ὅτι* 8
*προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. εἶπεν δὲ [ὁ] Ἡρῴδης* 9
*Ἰωάνην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα· τίς δέ ἐστιν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἀκούω*
*τοιαῦτα; καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν.*

7. *ὁ τετραάρχης*] So Mt. and Lk. More accurate than the popular use of the title *ὁ βασιλεύς* in Mk. *τὰ γινόμενα πάντα*] 'all that was happening.' Lk. again makes one of his universal statements. Mk. *φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.*

*καὶ διηπόρει*] The perplexity of Herod is peculiar to Lk. In Mk. he affirms confidently: 'John, whom I beheaded, is risen.' This may be intended literally, 'is risen from the dead,' or perhaps more probably (so Wellh., Klostermann) in a loose sense: 'This is John over again.' Lk. represents Herod as ending on the anxious question, 'Who is this?' and adds that 'he sought to see him.' This corresponds with Luke's account of Herod in the narrative of the trial (xxiii. 8), but it does not agree with Herod's intention as reported by the Pharisees in xiii. 31.

*διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν*] It is thought by some critics that the various surmises here reported were imported into Mk.'s narrative from the later narrative of the question to the disciples at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. viii. 27-28 = Lk. ix. 19). They were at any rate a part of the Marcan text as known to Lk. *διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὅτι* is an elegant paraphrase of Mk. *καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι*, 'and it was being said that.'

8. *ἐφάνη*] 'had appeared'—as foretold in Malachi. Mk. simply *Ἠλείας ἐστί.*

*ἄλλων δὲ ὅτι . . . ἀνέστη*] 'that a prophet of the old time had arisen.' Mk. 'that he was a prophet, as one of the prophets.'

### THE FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDE (ix. 10-17)
(Mk. vi. 30-43; Mt. xiv. 13-21; Jo. vi. 1-13)

The Apostles return from their journey and report their success. Jesus takes them apart. They are followed by multitudes who remain with them till eventide. At the command of Jesus, the disciples distribute to the multitudes their own provisions of bread and fish after these have first been blessed by Jesus.

The action of Jesus in 'blessing and breaking the bread' is recorded in words closely similar to those used at the account of the last supper and of the supper at Emmaus. The similarity will not be accidental. This story was in all probability valued from the early days of the Church as a historical prototype of the Eucharistic meals of the early community (Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7). When therefore John (*c.* vi.) attaches a Eucharistic discourse to his account of the miracle, he stands in line with primitive tradition.

"There is no ground for holding the feeding of the people to be mythical. The miracle disappears with the figures which, in oral tradition, are regularly liable to perversion. There then remains the genial picture of a beautiful evening on a lonely spot by the sea. The multitudes lie in groups upon the green grass, while the disciples move in and out distributing bread and fishes. The point is that Jesus not only feeds the people with doctrine, but also cares for their bodily wants, convinced that the provisions which have been brought for himself and his disciples will suffice also for the unbidden guests" (Wellhausen, *Evang. Marci*, p. 50).

10 *Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ*
*ὅσα ἐποίησαν. Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν*
11 *κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην* Βηθσαιδά. *οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι*
*γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς*
*ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλειας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρείαν*

10 *πολιν καλουμενην* Βηθσαιδα ℵ$^{a}$BLXΞ 33 aegg: *κωμην λεγομενην* Βηθσαιδα D: mult inter se variant codd *τοπον ερημον* ℵ$^{*\,et\,b}$ 69 157 syr.cur (cf. Mk vi. 32; Matt xiv. 13): *τοπον ερημον πολεως καλουμενης* Βηθσαιδαν AW mult al ϛ

10. *εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην* Βηθσαιδά] This, or *εἰς κώμην κ.* B., no doubt, is the true reading. *τόπον ἔρημον*, either substituted for these words or conflated with them, will be due to assimilation to the other Gospels, and perhaps also to a sense of the incongruity with *v.* 12, where the disciples and the multitude are said to be 'in a desert place.' Streeter prefers to read *κώμην* on the ground that it does, and *πόλιν* does not, suit the context. "One does not retire for privacy to a 'city'; but one may do so to a country village" (*Four Gospels*, p. 569). This is no doubt true of town-dwellers in England, but would it hold of an oriental village? Whether we read *κώμην* or *πόλιν*, there appears to be an inconsistency between this verse and *v.* 12, which is due to Lk.'s modification of Mk. Mk. gives *καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.* Lk.'s introduction of Bethsaida at this point is probably a sign that he was acquainted with the Marcan material which he has left out after the end of this paragraph. In Mk. vi. 45 *after* the feeding of the multitude the disciples go to Bethsaida, and in Mk. viii. 22 (immediately before the confession of Peter, viii. 27 f. = Lk. ix. 18 f.) 'they come to Bethsaida.'

11. *περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*] This definition of the content of the teaching of Jesus is added by Lk. Cf. Ac. i. 3.

ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰᾶτο. Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν· 12
προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπαν αὐτῷ Ἀπόλυσον τὸν
ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς
καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὕρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ
τόπῳ ἐσμέν. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς Δότε αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν 13
ὑμεῖς. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ ἄρτοι πέντε
καὶ ἰχθύες δύο, εἰ μήτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς
πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα. ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες 14
πεντακισχίλιοι. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ Κατακλίνατε
αὐτοὺς κλισίας ὡσεὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. καὶ ἐποίησαν 15
οὕτως καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαντας. λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε 16
ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς
παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ. καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν πάντες, 17
καὶ ἤρθη τὸ περισσεῦσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κόφινοι δώδεκα.

16 *ουρανον*] add *προσηυξατο και* D

*καὶ τοὺς χρείαν . . . ἰᾶτο*] This is not in Mk. There is a similar expansion in Mt. xiv. 14 *καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν.* The wording is entirely different in Mt. and Lk., and the two additions may be reasonably supposed to be independent.

12. *ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν*] Cf. xxiv. 29. Mk. *καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης.*

*καταλύσωσιν καὶ*] Add. Luc. *ἐπισιτισμόν*] Here only in N.T. Class. LXX. Luke greatly abbreviates his source.

14. *ἦσαν γὰρ ὥσει κτλ.*] The number of the multitude is transposed by Lk. from the end of the Marcan narrative.

*κατακλίνατε . . . κατέκλιναν*] It is probable that Lk. read *ἀνακλῖναι* in Mk. vi. 39 (DL al), not *ἀνακλιθῆναι* (ℵB 1 etc., *fortasse ex* Mt. xiv. 19).

*κλισία*] 'a dining party.' Good Greek from Homer downwards. Here only in N.T.

*ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα*] Mk. *κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα.*

16. The addition in D *προσηύξατο καί* is perhaps original. Cf. iii. 21 n. and ix. 18.

## Jesus confessed to be the Christ. The Passion foretold (ix. 18-27)

(Mk. viii. 27 f.; Mt. xvi. 13 f.; cf. Jo. vi. 67 f.)

We pass over several Marcan sections (see Introd. p. lix) and come to the great scene which divides St. Mark's Gospel: the confession of Peter followed by the first prophecy of the Passion, and the call to all who would be disciples to take up their cross and follow Jesus.

But the scene in Luke does not hold the decisive position which it holds in Mark. The great central section of the Gospel (ix. 51-xviii. 14) divides the first two Marcan prophecies of the Passion (ix. 22 and 44) from the third (xviii. 31), and the many other themes which intervene divert the steady movement towards the end which controls the arrangement in Mark.

The most important change which Luke makes in his source is that he omits Peter's rebuke of Jesus after the prophecy of the Passion, and Jesus' rebuke of Peter. The omission was no doubt deliberate in order to avoid an incident which might seem to reflect unfavourably upon the apostle.

18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας
συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς λέγων
19 Τίνα με οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν εἶναι; οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν
Ἰωάνην τὸν βαπτιστήν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἠλείαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι
20 προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ὑμεῖς
δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Τὸν
21 χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν
22 μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο, εἰπὼν ὅτι Δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

18 *συνησαν*] *συνηντησαν* B 245 f

18. After the mention of Bethsaida as the site of the feeding of the multitude there is in Lk. no further indication of place until the beginning of the great central section, ix. 51. In Mk. Jesus and his disciples are on the way to Caesarea Philippi when Jesus asks 'Who do men say that I am?' Lk. has omitted this, perhaps because he and his readers were uninterested in geographical detail, and says that Jesus was praying by himself. Cf. iii. 21 n. and *v.* 16 n. *supra*. The mention of the prayer of Jesus at this point may be a reminiscence of the lonely prayer recorded in Mk. vi. 46. *συνῆσαν* is difficult after *κατὰ μόνας*, but excellent sense is given if we assume B *συνήντησαν* to have preserved the original text. It is not easy to see why Streeter should conjecture *ἤντησαν* as the original reading, and suppose that it has been corrected by an ancestor of B by the prefixing of the prep. *συν* (*Four Gospels*, p. 177 n.). *ἀντάω* is a poetic word never found in the N.T., while *συναντάω* is common in Gk. prose and is attested four times elsewhere in Luke-Acts.

19. The answer of the disciples repeats the surmises which, according to *v.* 8, had already come to the ears of Herod. Lk. has revised the last conjecture (Mk. here *εἷς τῶν προφητῶν*) in the same words as before.

20. Peter confesses him to be the Christ. *τοῦ θεοῦ*] Add. Luc.

21-22. The prophecy of the rejection of the Son of Man, his death and resurrection, is in Mk. the beginning of a fresh paragraph: *καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτούς κτλ.* Lk. has closely linked it with the command to tell no man, thus seeming

*πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων
καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ
τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι. Ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας Εἴ τις* 23
*θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω
τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν, καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. ὃς γὰρ* 24
*ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν
ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.
τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον* 25
*ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς; ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με* 26
*καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται,
ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς*

23 *και αρατω . . . καθημεραν* om D a l: *καθημεραν* om C mult al lat.vet syr (sin.hl-mg) Orig 26 *λογους* om D a e l syr (sin.cur) Orig

to indicate that proclamation of his identity would be useless at present, since he must first be rejected.

22. Here Lk. omits the objection of Peter and his rebuke.

23. The approaching death now casts its shadow over the teaching. Men are called to surrender their lives, as Jesus must surrender his, to win them in the age to come.

*ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας*] An abbreviation of Mk. *καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.*

The explicit reference to 'the cross' seems to presuppose the crucifixion. The saying reappears xiv. 27 (= Mt. x. 38 Q), where see note.

*καθ' ἡμέραν*] Add. Luc. The addition facilitates the practical application of the saying to the life of the Christian Church. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 31. The omission of *καθ' ἡμέραν* by syr.sin. lat.vt. and others may be ascribed to the influence of the parallels. The omission of the entire sentence in D a l is harder to account for.

24. This saying also reappears in a slightly different form xvii. 33 (Mt. x. 39).

*ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ*] Here as in xviii. 28 (= Mk. x. 29) Lk. omits *καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.* He never uses the noun except twice in speeches in Acts—xv. 7, xx. 24.

25. Lk. improves the Greek of Mk. by transposing *τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον* into the passive, and converting *κερδῆσαι* and *ζημιωθῆναι* into participles in agreement with *ἄνθρωπος*. *ἀπολέσας ἢ*] Add. Luc. Lk. omits the explanatory verse Mk. viii. 37 *τί γὰρ δοῖ ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;*

26. Whosoever shall be ashamed of Jesus and his words, of him the Son of Man will be ashamed. Here as in the similar saying, xii. 8, 9 (= Mt. x. 32, 33), it is not *necessary* to assume that the speaker was understood to identify himself with the Son of Man. Here the Son of Man appears to exercise a more exalted function than in xii. 8, 9. There he makes confession of his own before the Father; here he is more closely associated with the Father. In Mt. xvi. 27 he is directly regarded as Judge. Lk. has slightly modified the language of Mk., and the modification may be significant.

27 *καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς, εἰσίν τινες τῶν αὐτοῦ ἑστηκότων οἳ οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.*

27 *την βασιλειαν του θεου*] *τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχομενον εν τη δοξη αυτου* D Orig (cf. Matt xvi. 28, xxv. 31): the kingdom of God coming in glory syr.cur

In Mk. the Son of Man comes in the glory of his Father with the angels; in Lk. he comes in his own glory and the glory of his Father and the glory of the angels. Possibly, as Loisy suggests, the Lucan phraseology indicates an approximation to the 'pluralistic' theology of the Apologists; cf. esp. Justin, *Ap.* i. 6. 2, where 'the host of angels' finds mention between the Son and the Spirit. Loofs, *Dogmengesch.*$^{4}$ p. 126.

27. *ἕως ἂν . . . τὴν β. τ. θ.*] There is no direct indication how Lk. understood this prophecy, but his omission from Mk. of the words *ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει* is significant. The first generation must have almost if not quite died out, and Lk. and his contemporaries still looked for a 'coming in power.' But Acts i. ii. suggest that he would have been able to recognise a fulfilment of the coming of the kingdom in the coming of the Spirit. The omission makes it easier to adopt such a spiritualised interpretation for the present text.

## THE TRANSFIGURATION (ix. 28-36)

The narrative of the Transfiguration stands in close connexion with the preceding confession of the Messiahship of Jesus. A supernatural manifestation sets the seal of a divine confirmation upon Peter's confession. The proclamation that Jesus is Son of God, already made at the Baptism, is now renewed in the presence of the chosen disciples, and the disciples are bidden to hearken to him. Jesus is seen speaking with the two greatest of the figures of the old covenant—Moses and Elijah—who, by their presence, testify to his Messiahship.

The narrative has been very differently estimated. See the commentaries on Mark. Wellhausen holds that the narrative was originally the account of a resurrection appearance—perhaps the appearance in Galilee, presupposed in the last chapter of Mark—which has been thrown back, at a later stage of the tradition, into the earthly life of Jesus. So Bultmann and others. Again, affinities have been traced between this narrative and the Ascension in Acts i. (the disciples with Jesus upon a mount; the cloud; two heavenly visitants) with the suggestion that we have here two divergent developments of the same tradition. On the other hand Harnack (*Sitzungsb. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1922, pp. 78 f.) and E. Meyer (*Ursprung* i. pp. 152 f.) strongly defend the view that the narrative is based upon an actual experience of the disciples in the lifetime of Jesus. Meyer traces the scepticism of modern critics to a 'rationalistic' prejudice. Whatever may be the true psychological account of the matter, there is abundant evidence that men have been convinced that they have themselves seen visions and heard voices. That there is a 'mythical' element in the present narrative is incontestable, but this may be explained from the background of 'myth' in the minds of Peter and his fellows. Harnack well argues that Peter's conviction of the resurrection of Jesus is, psychologically, more explicable if the vision of Christ risen confirmed the memory of an earlier vision which he had experienced while Jesus was with them in the flesh.

Norden (*Die Geburt des Kindes*, pp. 96 f.) follows Max Dessoir in giving an altogether different turn to the interpretation of the Transfiguration. Starting from the verb ἐπισκιάζειν (*v.* 34 = Mk. ix. 7), he suggests that the original version behind Mark may have represented the cloud as descending upon Jesus alone. The 'overshadowing' he illustrates from the mystical ideas and experiences which lie behind such passages as Philo, *Quis rer. div. her.* 53, p. 511 M.; *De Somn.* i. 19, p. 638 M.; *Quod deus immutabilis*, i. p. 273 M. (ὅταν ἀμυδρωθὲν ἐπισκιασθῇ τὸ διανοίας φῶς), where the darkening or overshadowing of the mind calls out an ecstatic mystical experience. Thus on this interpretation the fundamental idea in the story of the Transfiguration is a mystical union between the Divine Father and his Son. But it is very questionable whether we are justified in calling in Hellenistic mysticism to illustrate the primitive Christian narratives of the early synoptic tradition. Here it is unnecessary and—as it seems to the present editor—quite wrong to import these ideas, which are certainly not suggested by the text as it stands. The background of the Old Testament affords sufficient illustration. The 'overshadowing' of the cloud is a recognised symbol of the Divine presence (Ex. xl. 29 (35) καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη Μωσῆς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου, ὅτι ἐπεσκίαζεν ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἡ νεφέλη, καὶ δόξης Κυρίου ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή; 3 Regn. viii. 10), and the thought here is not mystical communion of Father and Son, but the Divine attestation of Jesus as Son of God, that is as Israel's Messiah.

There are a fair number of divergences from Mark, but they are "well within the limits of editorial conjecture or inference from the context" (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 215).

Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ 28

28. ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους] The Biblical phraseology is introduced by Luke, τοὺς λόγους τούτους, i.e. the sayings recorded in

παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ
29 ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν
τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς
30 αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν
31 αὐτῷ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας, οἳ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ
ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ.
32 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ· διαγρηγορήσαντες
δὲ εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας
33 τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι

the preceding verses. Or else τοὺς λόγους may be a Hebraism, 'after these things' (so Wellh.). Cf. 1 Macc. vii. 33 καὶ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἀνέβη Νικάνωρ.

ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ] Mk. μετὰ ἡμέρας ἕξ. This is the only place in Mk., apart from the last days, where a definite interval of time is noted. The explanation here may be that the connexion between this paragraph and the preceding already existed in Mk.'s source. Wellh., on the other hand (*Ev. Marci*, p. 71), in accordance with his view of the narrative (see introd. above) thinks that the six days may originally have determined the interval between the death of Jesus and his appearance in Galilee. ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ is prob. a loose expression meaning 'about a week' (cf. Jo. xx. 26) and thus does not differ essentially from Mk.

Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ Ἰάκωβον] On the Lucan order of the names cf. viii. 51 n.

εἰς τὸ ὄρος] A reader of Luke naturally recalls the mountain to which Jesus retired to pray, vi. 12. But Mk. gives no article εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν, and according to Mk.'s version Jesus may be presumed to be still in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi.

That Jesus retired to pray and that it was while he was praying that his appearance changed is stated by Lk. alone, cf. iii. 21 n.

29. τὸ εἶδος . . . ἕτερον] Lk. avoids Mk.'s word μετεμορφώθη (= Mt. xvii. 2; elsewhere in N.T. Ro. xii. 2, 2 Cor. iii. 18), possibly because of its heathen associations.

ἱματισμὸς . . . λευκός] Lk. omits Mk.'s homely comparison λευκὰ λίαν οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι.

31. οἳ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ] Mk. simply ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Ἠλείας σὺν Μωυσεῖ.

ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ κτλ.] Mk. says that they spoke with Jesus, without giving the subject of their speech. Lk.'s version sets the scene in relation to the preceding prophecy of the Passion.

ἔξοδος] Of death; again in N.T. only 2 Pet. i. 15. Also in Wisd. iii. 2, vii. 6; Jos. *Ant.* iv. 189 ἐπ' ἐξόδου τοῦ ζῆν, and see Preuschen-Bauer, *s.v.*

32. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ κτλ.] At the time of the appearance Peter and his fellows had been sunk in sleep. They awake and behold Jesus in glory with the two visitants. As Moses and Elijah begin to depart, Peter addresses Jesus. All this is Lucan interpretation of the scene, without parallel in Mk. The words καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ probably convey Lk.'s

αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν Ἐπι-
στάτα, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς
τρεῖς, μίαν σοὶ καὶ μίαν Μωυσεῖ καὶ μίαν Ἠλείᾳ, μὴ εἰδὼς
ὃ λέγει. ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπ- 34
εσκίαζεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς
τὴν νεφέλην. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα 35
Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. καὶ 36
ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὑρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος. καὶ αὐτοὶ
ἐσίγησαν καὶ οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις
οὐδὲν ὧν ἑώρακαν.

35 ο εκλελεγμενος ℵBLΞ (ο εκλεκτος Θ 1) a ff$^2$ l syr (sin.hl-mg) aegg : ο αγαπητος ACD al pler b c e f g vg syr (cur.hl.vg) ϛ (cf. Matt xvii. 5, Mc ix. 7)

interpretation of the dazed words of Peter: Peter sees the heavenly figures about to depart and therefore proposes that tents should be put up in which they might remain.

Mk. adds that Peter knew not what to say, 'for they were afraid.' In Lk. the fear of the disciples is associated with the entry of Jesus and the prophets into the cloud.

34. ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς] The pronouns are obscure, but the meaning seems to be that the cloud overshadowed Jesus, Moses, and Elijah. Similarly in the next sentence the disciples are subject to ἐφοβήθησαν, and αὐτούς again means the three figures in glory. This is confirmed by the next verse, where the voice comes to the disciples 'out of the cloud.'

35. ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος] This is no doubt the original Lucan reading, the variants being due to assimilation. The word occurs in this quasi-technical sense here only in N.T., but cf. ὁ ἐκλεκτός xxiii. 35 n.

αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε] There is probably an echo of Deut. xviii. 15 (applied to Jesus by the early Church, Ac. iii. 22, Jo. i. 21) προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεός σου σοί, αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε. The transposition of the words (Mk. ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ) in Lk. is perhaps to be ascribed to reminiscence of this LXX text.

36. In Mk. Jesus himself enjoins silence upon the disciples until after the resurrection. He has already forbidden the devils to make known who he was; now the disciples are similarly charged to keep silence concerning the proof of his divine sonship, which has been vouchsafed to them. Lk., on the other hand, merely makes the statement that in fact the disciples in those days told no man what they had seen.

Lk. omits at this point the question of the disciples concerning the coming of Elijah and the reply of Jesus. Luke nowhere identifies John the Baptist with Elijah 'who was to come.'

## The Healing of a possessed Boy (ix. 37-43)

In Luke, as in the other synoptic Gospels, the Transfiguration on the Mount is followed by a descent into a scene of suffering where Jesus brings alleviation. Luke, like Matthew, has very greatly abbreviated the lengthy Marcan account of the healing of the possessed boy, omitting the conversation with the father about the boy's sickness which Mark recounts as occurring during a seizure of the boy, and also the stages of the boy's gradual recovery after Jesus has exorcised the spirit. That Matthew and Luke should agree in much of their abbreviation is not strange. Neither this agreement nor some minor agreements in language are enough to warrant the hypothesis of any second common source.

37 Ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ
38 ὄρους συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ
τοῦ ὄχλου ἐβόησεν λέγων Διδάσκαλε, δέομαί σου ἐπιβλέψαι
39 ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου, ὅτι μονογενής μοί ἐστιν, καὶ ἰδοὺ πνεῦμα
λαμβάνει αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέφνης κράζει, καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτὸν
μετὰ ἀφροῦ καὶ μόλις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συντρῖβον αὐτόν·
40 καὶ ἐδεήθην τῶν μαθητῶν σου ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτό, καὶ οὐκ
41 ἠδυνήθησαν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Ὦ γενεὰ
ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ
42 ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; προσάγαγε ὧδε τὸν υἱόν σου. ἔτι δὲ προσ-

37 *τη εξης ημερα*] *δια της ημερας* D simil lat.vt. syr.vt sah$^{cod}$ 41 *και διεστραμμενη* om e Marcion (apud Tert et Epiph): *απιστος* et *διεστραμμενη* transponunt C syr.vt

37. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους] Cf. *v.* 28 n.

38. ὅτι μονογενής μοί ἐστιν] A Lucan addition, for which cf. vii. 12 and viii. 41.

40. The failure of the disciples to deal with the case is reproduced from Mk., but it does not, as in Mk., lead on to a subsequent conversation with Jesus as to why they had failed.

41. ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος . . . ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;] This apostrophe (from Mk.) does not seem to correspond well with the situation. To whom is it addressed? To the multitudes? or to the disciples? ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος seems to call for a wider reference than to the disciples. But why should the boy's possession call for a general rebuke to the people? Perhaps the words should not be interpreted out of the actual situation, but regarded as "the speech of a divine being, who has appeared for a brief interval in human form, and is soon to withdraw again to heaven" (Dibelius).

καὶ διεστραμμένη] Not in Mk., but found also in Mt. Possibly the words are not original here. See crit. note. In any case they are an echo of the Old Testament. Cf. Deut. xxxii. 5, a passage which is also quoted in Phil. ii. 15.

ὧδε] Another minor and probably accidental agreement with Mt. against Mk.

42. ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ] The seizure in Mk. comes on as the spirit beholds Jesus. Lk. makes no such connexion.

ερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπάρα-
ξεν· ἐπετίμησεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ
ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ.
ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ. 43

καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ] An interesting illustration of Lk.'s free treatment of his source. He has left out Mk.'s account of the gradual restoration of the afflicted boy, and he has added this slight touch to finish the picture. It is an exact parallel to vii. 15 καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ.

43. The private colloquy between Jesus and the disciples here falls out (Mk. ix. 28, 29), and the paragraph concludes, as so frequently in Lucan accounts of a miracle, with the wonder of the people.

ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι] Here only in the Gospels. The word occurs in non-religious associations in Inscrr. (*O.G.I.S.* 666. 26; 669. 9), and rarely in LXX (Jer. xl. 9). It is found several times in early Greek Christian literature, always, as here, in relation to God or divine attributes. Acts xix. 27 (of Artemis); 2 Pet. i. 16; Ign. *Rom.* (address); 1 Clem. xxiv. 5; *ad Diogn.* x. 5.

### The Passion foretold. Who is the Greatest? On casting out Devils in the Name of Jesus (ix. 43b-50)

These three paragraphs which close the northern ministry in Luke are taken over from Mark, where they occur in the corresponding place and the same order (Mk. ix. 30-40). Luke omits a collection of disjointed sayings which follow in Mark. He has no parallel to Mk. ix. 41 (on giving a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple), nor to Mk. ix. 43-47 ("If thy hand cause thee to offend," etc.). But he has a parallel to Mk. ix. 42 in xvii. 2, and to Mk. ix. 50 in xiv. 34.

Πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐποίει εἶπεν πρὸς
τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ Θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τοὺς 44
λόγους τούτους, ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παρα-

43b. πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων κτλ.] Lk. has already omitted to state that Jesus *left* Galilee before the Confession of Peter and the Transfiguration; similarly here he omits from Mk. the statement that Jesus *returned* to Galilee, and that he passed through *incognito*. Lk. has created instead his own setting for the prophecy. The world (πάντων) was wondering at all his deeds, and the wonder of the world made it necessary that the disciples should be forewarned as to what lay before him.

44. θέσθε εἰς τὰ ὦτα . . . τούτους] Add. Luc. The language is Biblical, cf. Ex. xvii. 14 δὸς εἰς τὰ ὦτα Ἰησοῖ. λόγους is taken by some as a Hebraism for "these things," i.e. the events which have just been recorded (cf. *v.* 28 n.). γάρ may then bear its usual meaning 'for,' 'since.' It is necessary for the disciples to remember these events, for their faith is to be tried by

45 *δίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων. οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο,
καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπʼ αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ αἴσθωνται
αὐτό, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος
46 τούτου. Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ
47 τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰδὼς τὸν δια-
λογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν
48 αὐτὸ παρʼ ἑαυτῷ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὃς ἂν δέξηται τοῦτο
τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ
δέξηται δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με· ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν
49 πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός ἐστιν μέγας. Ἀποκρι-
θεὶς δὲ Ἰωάνης εἶπεν Ἐπιστάτα, εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί*

the approaching Passion. But *θέσθε εἰς τὰ ὦτα* is strongly in favour of taking *λόγους* to mean 'words.' *λόγους* must then refer to the saying which follows, and *γάρ* must be taken in an epexegetical sense: 'these words, namely.' Lk. omits to reproduce from Mk. the prophecy of the resurrection.

45. *καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον . . . αἴσθωνται αὐτό*] Add. Luc., cf. xviii. 34, xxiv. 16.

*ἵνα μή*] It is not necessary to give *ἵνα* a final force. As often in the later Greek it may merely denote consequence. Cf. Blass, § 69. 3.

*περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου*] Add. Luc.

46-48. In Mk. this conversation takes place in a house at Capernaum in consequence of a dispute which the disciples had held on the way. All this disappears in Lk.

46. *τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν*] Prob. which of them should be greatest in the future kingdom which was to be established. *μείζων* comparat. for superlative. So also *μικρότερος* in *v.* 48. Blass, § 11. 3.

47. *εἰδὼς τὸν διαλογισμόν*] Jesus knows intuitively. The same is implied, though not stated, in Mk. In Mk. Jesus questions the disciples as to their conversation, and the disciples in shame forbear to answer.

*παρʼ ἑαυτῷ*] For *ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν* Mk. Lk., with Mt., omits to say that Jesus embraced the child.

48. There are two distinct thoughts here. (1) He who is lowliest is greatest (48 b). (This really answers the question of *v.* 46. The corresponding saying in Mk. *precedes* the incident of the child. The order has been changed by Lk.) (2) He who receives a little child in the name of Jesus receives Jesus, and he who receives Jesus receives him who sent Jesus (48 a). In this saying the child is not treated as a type of that childlike character which is necessary for entry into the kingdom (as in xviii. 17), but as a type of one of 'the least,' to whom the obligation of love is due. Cf. Mt. xxv. 45. Wellhausen is probably right in detecting in Mk. a combination of two stories originally distinct in idea. But the juxtaposition is happy. The service of love, in which true greatness consists, is tested by its operation towards the most insignificant.

49-50. It is most unlikely that exorcism in the name of Jesus would be practised in his life-time on earth. It may be inferred that the question

σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐκ
ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦς Μὴ 50
κωλύετε, ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν.

had arisen in the community as to what attitude should be adopted towards those who, though not strictly members of the Church, successfully exorcised in the name of Jesus. Answer is given in the form of an incident that such exorcists are not to be hindered. Acts xix. 13 records unsuccessful attempts of Jewish exorcists to drive out devils in the name of Jesus.

49. οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν] i.e. prob. 'he does not follow [thee] with us.' Mk. ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν (i.e. Jesus and the disciples). Lk. seems to dissociate Jesus and the disciples. So in the reply for καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (Mk.) Lk. substitutes καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. Perhaps Lk. wishes to avoid a formal contradiction with the converse saying in xi. 23 (Q). The two sayings are not necessarily incompatible. xi. 23 is an appeal to the individual to abandon an attitude of neutrality. Here the saying is a principle to govern the conduct of the disciples towards those who stand outside the inner circle.

Lk. omits from Mk. οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με.

## The Journey to Jerusalem (ix. 51-xix. 48)

This is considerably the longest section of the Gospel. It purports to describe the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem with his disciples, which resulted in the crucifixion (ix. 51). That they were on the road to Jerusalem is stated at ix. 53, xiii. 22, 33, xvii. 11, xviii. 31. At xix. 11 he is near to Jerusalem; at xix. 41 he is within sight of the city, and at xix. 45 he enters the temple. It is implied at ix. 52 that he followed the route through Samaria. But at xviii. 35, xix. 1 he passes through Jericho. This is not consistent with a *direct* journey to Jerusalem through Samaria.

It is, however, clear that very much of the contents of these chapters is not in place in a genuine journey. The thronging multitudes (xi. 29, xii. 1, xiv. 25), the sabbath day preachings (xiii. 10), the offended Pharisees (xiv. 1), the reports of Herod's hostility (xiii. 31), suggest the background of the Galilean ministry rather than a set journey through Samaria to Jerusalem. Again, the great parables of *cc.* xiv., xv., xvi. are loosely strung together and have no close connexion with the narrative.

These discrepancies between the formal character and the actual contents of this section find an explanation when the Gospel is compared with the Marcan source. At ix. 51 the Marcan source, which Luke has followed closely for the greater part of his account of the Galilean ministry, is dropped. It is resumed again at xviii. 15, and from there onwards it again provides Luke with the main substance of his narrative for the rest of the journey to Jerusalem, except for two consecutive non-Marcan paragraphs—xix. 1-10 (Zacchaeus), and 11-28 (parable of the pounds). But between ix. 51 and xviii. 15, that is to say for the greater part of what purports to be the narrative of the journey, the Marcan source is not used. The few parallels to Marcan material which these chapters contain (e.g. xi. 14 f., 'casting out devils by Beelzebub'; xiii. 18 f., the parable of the mustard seed) are shewn by comparison with Matthew to be derived from a common non-Marcan source, presumably Q. A large proportion of the material is common to Matthew (Q). The rest is peculiar to Luke. The data seem to be well accounted for if we suppose that Luke wished to incorporate a large body of teaching, without disturbing the essential framework of Mark. Mark says (x. 1) that Jesus journeyed to 'the borders of Judaea,' but gives no particulars of the journey. Luke availed himself of this journey to provide a *cadre* for his additional material. The reading and the exact meaning of Mk. x. 1 are alike obscure (cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.*), but Mark seems to imply that Jesus journeyed through Peraea, and this is confirmed by the mention of his passing through Jericho (x. 46). Luke, on the other hand, has material (ix. 52 f.) which brings Jesus to Samaria. Moreover, he is probably desirous of including a Samaritan mission as prefiguring the universal expansion of the Church (cf. John iv.). Accordingly he makes Jesus advance through Samaria. But the influence of the Marcan source still makes him bring Jesus to Jericho, although it was not on the route to Jerusalem through Samaria. The explanation of the geographical obscurity is therefore literary.[1]

It is impossible to reach secure conclusions as to the number, nature, and extent of Luke's sources in this section. Streeter thinks that Q and L had already been combined to form a continuous narrative before they were worked into the Gospel as it stands. This central section was the principal part of 'Proto-Luke,' and 'Proto-Luke' was "practically a Gospel, giving a story parallel with Mark's, from the Preaching of John to the Passion and the Resurrection" (*Four Gospels*, p. 217). The greater part of

---

[1] For a very ingenious attempt to combine the statements of Mk. and Lk. with reference to the journey see Burkitt, *The Gospel History*, p. 96 n. Burkitt suggests that Peter (Mark's authority) travelled through Peraea, and that *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* (Mk. ix. 1) is written from Peter's point of view, i.e. it means W. not E. of Jordan. Jesus really travelled, as Luke says, through Samaria, in order to avoid the territory of Antipas (which included Peraea). It may be questioned whether *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* could have been understood in this sense, and the Lucan Gospel at any rate is too far removed from personal reminiscence to justify confidence in the order and accuracy of its itinerary.

'Proto-Luke' was therefore devoted to a narrative of the journey to Jerusalem. The theory of 'Proto-Luke' does not help to account for the discrepancy between the contents and the narrative framework of this section. On the other hand it seems possible to account for this discrepancy if we assume that the element of continuous narrative has been imposed upon the material expressly in order to adapt it to its present position in the Gospel.

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀνα- 51
λήμψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ
πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ 52
προσώπου αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσῆλθον εἰς κώμην
Σαμαρειτῶν, ὡς ἑτοιμάσαι αὐτῷ· καὶ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν, 53
ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.
ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάνης εἶπαν Κύριε, 54
θέλεις εἴπωμεν ΠΥ͂Ρ ΚΑΤΑΒΗ͂ΝΑΙ ἈΠῸ ΤΟΥ͂ ΟΥ̓ΡΑΝΟΥ͂ ΚΑῚ ἈΝΑΛΩ͂ϹΑΙ

54 *αναλωσαι αυτους*] add *ως και Ηλιας εποιησεν* ACD al pler a b f q syr.vg boh$^{codd}$ ϛ om ℵBLΞ 71 157 700* e vg syr.vt arm aegg Cyr

51-56. The incident provides a practical illustration of the teaching of non-resistance to evil (vi. 29). The narrative is peculiar to Luke. It is to be set in juxtaposition to 4 Regn. i. 9 f. Jesus will not act on the precedent set by Elijah, as his too hasty disciples desire.

51. *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ . . . καὶ αὐτὸς . . . ἐστήρισεν*] For the constr. cf. i. 8 n. *ἀναλήμψεως*, 'assumption.' The noun does not occur elsewhere in the Greek Bible (but cf. Test. Lev. xviii. (codd.); Ps. Sol. iv. 20; Ass. Mos. x. 12). For the verb cf. [Mk.] xvi. 19; Ac. i. 2, 11, 22; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Here the term perhaps connotes the various stages by which Jesus passed from an earthly to a heavenly existence (cf. *ἔξοδος v.* 31 *supra*) rather than the single incident of the Ascension into heaven (Klostermann). *τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν*] A Semitism. Cf. Dan. xi. 17, 18; Jer. xxi. 10 *ἐστήρικα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν*; Ez. vi. 2, etc.

52. *ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους*] Apparently not to preach, but to prepare quarters. Cf. xxii. 8. *εἰς κώμην Σαμαρειτῶν*] For the journeys of Galileans to Jerusalem through Samaritan territory, and the disturbances which were liable to occur, cf. Jos. *Ant.* xx. 6. 1.

53. *τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον*] Another Semitism. Cf. 2 Regn. xvii. 11 *καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου πορευόμενον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*.

54. *οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάνης*] The surname of the sons of Zebedee, *Βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς*, is given Mk. iii. 17. It is not reproduced by Lk., but this incident gives an explanation of the name.

54-55. The additions attested by Western authorities (see crit. note) are in all probability not part of the original text. The words *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . ἀλλὰ σῶσαι* have a close parallel in xix. 10. Rendel Harris (*T. and S.* ii. 1, p. 232) traces the Western additions to Marcionite influence. Zahn, on the other

55 αὐτούς; στραφεὶς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν
56 εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην.

57 Καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπέν τις πρὸς αὐτόν
58 Ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ [ὁ]
Ἰησοῦς Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ
59 τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον Ἀκολούθει μοι.
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθόντι θάψαι τὸν

55 επετιμησεν αυτοις] add και ειπεν ουκ οιδατε ει ου πνευματος εστε [υμεις] ο [γαρ] υιος του ανθρωπου ουκ ηλθε ψυχας [ανθρωπων] απολεσαι (vel αποκτειναι) αλλα σωσαι D (usque ad εστε) Θ al permu latt syr (cur.vg) arm boh$^{\text{codd}}$ Cypr al ϛ : om ℵABC 157 mult al l syr.sin aegg Bas Cyr

hand, thinks that they are original and were later omitted from the motive of opposition to Marcionism. The story of Elijah is in any case in mind: 4 Regn. i. 10 καὶ κατέβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς πεντήκοντα αὐτοῦ.

57-62. The sayings of Jesus to three would-be disciples occur here with great appropriateness at the beginning of the last journey to Jerusalem, when to follow Jesus meant to follow him to death. The first two are found, with but slight variations, in Mt. viii. 19-22. The last is peculiar to Lk. In the last and perhaps also in the second we seem to have another reminiscence of the history of Elijah. See the narrative of the call of Elisha, 3 Regn. xix. 20 f.

57-58. εἶπέν τις] In Mt. a scribe. This is an enthusiastic hearer who has not counted the cost of discipleship. The great saying has a striking parallel in Plut. *Vit. Tib. Gracch.* 9. 828 c τὰ μὲν θηρία τὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν νεμόμενα καὶ φωλεὸν ἔχει καὶ κοιταῖόν ἐστιν αὐτῶν ἑκάστῳ καὶ κατάδυσις, τοῖς δ' ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἰταλίας μαχομένοις καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἀέρος καὶ φωτὸς ἄλλου δ' οὐδενὸς μέτεστιν, ἀλλ' ἄοικοι καὶ ἀνίδρυτοι μετὰ τέκνων πλανῶνται καὶ γυναικῶν. . . . There as here the security of the beasts is contrasted with a particular case of human need. Bultmann (*G.S.T.* pp. 14, 58) thinks that the saying has been adapted from a pessimistic saying of Jewish proverbial philosophy concerning the life of man and given a new Christian reference: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου originally meant 'man' contrasted with the beasts. But as a generalization the contrast would be clearly untrue to life: many men have houses. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου here means Jesus. This usage is also found in Mt. viii. 20 and therefore goes back to Q.

59-60. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον] Jesus here takes the initiative. This has more point than the version in Mt. where the injunction to follow is a part of the reply of Jesus to the man's request. The burial of a father was to a Jew a primary duty of filial piety. Cf. Tobit iv. 3, vi. 15. But even this must yield to the higher claim of the kingdom of God. Cf. xiv. 26. ἄφες τοὺς νεκρούς] Best understood, in a transferred sense, of those who have not followed Jesus and therefore have not entered into life. "It would be unjust and unreason-

πατέρα μου. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι 60
τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς, σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διάγγελλε τὴν βασιλείαν
τοῦ θεοῦ. εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος Ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε· 61
πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου.
εἶπεν δὲ [πρὸς αὐτὸν] ὁ Ἰησοῦς Οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα 62
ἐπ᾽ ἄροτρον καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω εὔθετός ἐστιν τῇ
βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

62 *ουδεις . . . οπισω] ουδεις εις τα οπισω βλεπων και επιβαλλων την χειρα αυτου επ αροτρον* D lat. vet Clem Cypr

able to exalt the saying into a principle for all times and seasons. A man would have to leave his father unburied to join his regiment in war. To proclaim the kingdom of God was a still greater need. . . . The honouring of parents is so deeply rooted in the Jewish consciousness that these sayings of Jesus, though explicable and even justifiable, have a not wholly Jewish ring. . . . Moreover, it must be allowed that these somewhat un-Jewish sayings of Jesus produced un-Jewish results" (Montefiore). Cf. Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. i. pp. 537, 616, quoted by M.

60. σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν . . . τοῦ θεοῦ] Not in Mt., and prob. added by Lk.

61-62. Unlike Elisha, this disciple is not to be allowed to bid farewell to his family. The incident is not in Mt. Lk. may have added it to provide a setting for a great saying. εὔθετος] i.e. fit to work for the kingdom of God. Cf. Hes. *Works and Days* 443 ὃς ἔργον μελετῶν ἰθεῖάν κ᾽ αὔλακ᾽ ἐλαύνοι, μηκέτι παπταίνων μεθ᾽ ὁμήλικας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ θυμὸν ἔχων.

## The Mission of the Seventy and their Return (x. 1-24)

The Lord commissions a further body of seventy[-two] disciples to prepare the way for his advance. They return rejoicing at the success of their mission. Jesus thanks the Father for that he has revealed to the simple what is hidden from the wise, and pronounces a blessing upon his disciples.

With the exception of *v.* 1 and *vv.* 17-20 the whole of this section has parallels in Mt. Lk. intends it to be read in connexion, but the arrangement is probably his own. In Mt., and perhaps in Q, the thanksgiving of Jesus (Mt. xi. 25-27 = Lk. x. 21-22) follows after the denunciations of the unrepentant cities (Mt. xi. 21-24 = Lk. x. 13-15), and both are separated from the charge to the disciples.

The appointment of the seventy[-two] disciples is unknown to the other Gospels and to the rest of the N.T. The main content of the charge (*vv.* 2-11, 16) is in Mt. ix. 37 f. conflated with Mk. vi. 7-13 and forms part of the charge to the Twelve. It is probable that the original in Q was a variant version of Mk. vi. 7-13 (to which it bears close resemblance), and that Lk., who has already reproduced Mk. vi. 7-13, has himself constructed the narrative setting to fit his second source. It is to be noted that Lk. xxii. 35 f. (ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλλαντίου καὶ πήρας καὶ ὑποδημάτων . . .) looks back to x. 4 (contrast Mk. vi. 8, Mt. x. 9 and Lk. viii. 3), and assumes that the injunction of x. 4 had been delivered to the Twelve, not to the seventy. Moreover the narrative introduction does not altogether fit the charge: Jesus is said to dispatch the disciples by twos to every city where he himself would come, like the messengers referred to above (*v.* 52); the charge, however, implies an independent ministry, without direct reference to the approach of Jesus in person. Again the return of the seventy in a body to Jesus does not easily harmonise with the conception that they had been sent out in advance by twos "to every city and place where he himself would come."

The disciples are to travel and to live in extreme simplicity. They are commissioned to heal the sick and to proclaim the near approach of the kingdom.

The number 'seventy' probably has a symbolic value as corresponding with the number of the nations of the earth in Gen. x. (70 in Heb., 72 in LXX), as the Twelve correspond to the number of the twelve tribes.

An alternative but less probable suggestion is that the seventy[-two] are a counterpart to the seventy elders chosen to assist Moses. (Ex. xxiv. 1; Num. xi. 16. To the seventy elders add Eldad and Medad. Cf. Clem. *Rec.* i. 40.)

X. 1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα
[δύο] καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο [δύο] πρὸ προσώπου
αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον οὗ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχε-
2 σθαι. ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς Ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ
δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ

1 εβδομηκοντα ℵACL al pler b f q syr (vg.hl) boh Iren Tert Eus Cyr ϛ : εβδομηκοντα δυο BDMR a c e vg syr.vt arm sah Epiph Clem-Recogn Aug.

1. ἀνέδειξεν] 'appointed.' So Ac. i. 24. Lucan only in N.T. Plut., Polyb. ὁ κύριος] Cf. vii. 13 n. ἑβδομήκοντα δύο] The reading of B D is to be preferred. There would be a tendency to make 72 into a round number. Similar confusion between 70 and 72 occurs in Gen. x. (the number of the peoples) as between Heb. and LXX; likewise in the traditional number of the Greek translators of the O.T. Cf. Epiph. *Exp. Fid.*, Migne *PG.* xlii. 780.

2. ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς . . . θερισμὸν

ὅπως ἐργάτας ἐκβάλῃ εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ. ὑπάγετε· 3
ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. μὴ βαστά- 4
ζετε βαλλάντιον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ ὑποδήματα, καὶ μηδένα κατὰ
τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσησθε. εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν πρῶτον 5
λέγετε Εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ. καὶ ἐὰν ἐκεῖ ᾖ υἱὸς 6
εἰρήνης, ἐπαναπαήσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν· εἰ δὲ μήγε,
ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀνακάμψει. ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἔσθοντες 7
καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν, ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ
αὐτοῦ. μὴ μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν. καὶ εἰς ἣν 8
ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρα-

αὐτοῦ] Practically identical in wording with Mt. ix. 37, 38, where, however, it is appropriately placed *before* the choice of the Twelve.

3. || Mt. x. 16 (om. *ὑπάγετε*: for *ἄρνας*, *πρόβατα*). Lk. does not give the injunction which follows in Mt.: *γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.*

4. The Twelve in Mk. vi. 8 are allowed *σανδάλια* (= *ὑποδήματα*), a staff, and one *χιτών*. Shoes and a staff are forbidden in Mt. x. 10. In Lk. ix. 3 a staff is forbidden to the Twelve, and here shoes are forbidden to the seventy. *βαλλάντιον*] 'A purse' in N.T. only here, xii. 33, and xxii. 35. Mk. and Mt. assume that money is carried in the girdle. Cf. Schol. to Aristoph. *Ran.* 784 (Dindorf, *Aristoph.* iv. pt. 2, p. 98) *βαλαντιητόμοις: τοῖς τὰ βαλάντια τέμνουσι, ἃ ἐν ταῖς ζώναις ἀπηωρημένα φέρουσιν ἄνθρωποι.* *μηδένα . . . ἀσπάσησθε*] Because the minds of the missionaries must be fixed on their purpose. Cf. 4 Regn. iv. 29.

5-12. The material is found in Mt. x. in briefer form and somewhat differently arranged. Cf. Mt. x. 11-13, 10b, 7, 14-15.

7. The missionaries are entitled to ordinary hospitality, on the principle that 'the labourer is worthy of his hire.' Mt. states the principle, but in a less appropriate place, and does not mention the right to hospitality. It seems probable that the source is more closely followed in Lk., and that it has been compressed and rearranged by Mt. *ἄξιος γὰρ . . . μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ*] For *μισθοῦ* Mt. gives *τροφῆς*. The saying is quoted in its Lucan form in 1 Tim. v. 18. This is no doubt the saying to which Paul alludes, 1 Cor. ix. 7, 14 *οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν.*

8. *ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν*] Cf. *ἔσθοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν* above. There is striking resemblance in language to 1 Cor. x. 27 *πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ὑμῖν ἐσθίετε, μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν*, where, however, the point is that the Christian is not to ask questions as to whether the meat which is put before him is clean or unclean according to the Mosaic Law. That idea is not to be read into this passage, but it is not unlikely that St. Paul's language is an echo of this injunction, adapted to the conditions of the Gentile mission.

9 τιθέμενα ὑμῖν, καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς, καὶ
10 λέγετε αὐτοῖς Ἤγγικεν ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. εἰς
ἣν δ᾽ ἂν πόλιν εἰσέλθητε καὶ μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξελθόντες
11 εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς εἴπατε Καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν
κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν· πλὴν τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία
12 τοῦ θεοῦ. λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκ-
13 τότερον ἔσται ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. Οὐαί σοι, Χοραζείν· οὐαί
σοι, Βηθσαιδά· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγενήθησαν αἱ
δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ
14 καθήμενοι μετενόησαν. πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον
15 ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἢ ὑμῖν. Καὶ σύ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἕως
16 οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; ἕως τοῦ ᾅδου καταβήσῃ. Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν

9. ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς] Not in Mt. With the addition of ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς the saying suggests that the kingdom may be thought of as already present, to be accepted or rejected, among those to whom it is preached.

11. καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν . . .] A similar injunction Mk. vi. 11 (=ix. 5 *supra*) and Mt. x. 14. Cf. Ac. xiii. 51.

ἀπομάσσειν] A good Greek word. Here only in N.T. ἐκμάσσειν occurs vii. 38, *q.v.*

13-15. The fate of the city which shall disobey the call of the missionaries leads Jesus to pronounce the doom of the Galilean cities which have already failed to repent in spite of the wonders which they have witnessed. But the connexion is not good, and is probably due to the editing either of the evangelist or his source. The same verses are found as a separate section in Mt. xi. 20-24 with a concluding verse which affirms that the fate of Capernaum shall be worse than that of Sodom. Cf. *supra v.* 12 = Mt. x. 15 (where, however, Gomorra is coupled with Sodom). The verses are perhaps "the pronouncement of a Christian prophet casting a retrospective glance at the work of Jesus in Galilee" (Loisy).

13. Χοράζειν] Unknown to the Gospels apart from this and the parallel verse in Mt. — a striking illustration of the fragmentary character of the narratives embodied in the Gospels. The modern *Kerâzeh* is about an hour's distance from *Tell Ḥûm* and nearly due north. Sanday, *Sacred Sites*, p. 24.

14. Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι] The perspective is that of an inhabitant of Palestine. Tyre and Sidon represent the heathen world.

15. Is. xiv. 13-15 σὺ δὲ (i.e. the king of Babylon) εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι . . . νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδην καταβήσῃ.

16. Jesus addresses the missionaries again. The messengers proclaim what Jesus has put into their mouths, and Jesus proclaims what he who sent him has enjoined. The message is one and it is God's. The charge in Mt. similarly concludes: ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με, followed by two further verses of exposition.

ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν
ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ 17
ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] μετὰ χαρᾶς λέγοντες Κύριε, καὶ τὰ
δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου. εἶπεν δὲ 18
αὐτοῖς Ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ 19
πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν
δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσει. πλὴν 20
ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται,
χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐνγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι 21

17 *εβδομηκοντα*] add *δυο* BD latt syr.sin ? syr.hl-mg arm sah. vide ad *v.* 1

17. *ὑπέστρεψαν*] Similarly the return of the Twelve after their mission is narrated (ix. 10 = Mk. vi. 30). The disciples are filled with a joyful astonishment at their power over the forces of evil. *ὑποτάσσεσθαι*] Used of the subjection of spirits 1 Cor. xiv. 32. Great Paris Mag. Pap. 3080 *καὶ ὑποταγήσεταί σοι πᾶν πνεῦμα καὶ δαιμόνιον ὁποῖον ἐὰν ᾖν* (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, E.T., 1927, p. 258).

18. *τὸν Σατανᾶν*] Here as elsewhere in N.T. Satan is head of the powers of evil. In Rev. xii. we hear of his being defeated and cast out of heaven by Michael and his hosts. A similar idea lies behind this saying. The consciousness that he has already broken the power of the evil spirits, with Satan at their head, is implied here as in xi. 17 f. = Mk. iii. 23 f. An ecstatic vision on the part of Jesus is suggested, but it is not clear when we are to understand it to have taken place—perhaps during the absence of the seventy. *ἐθεώρουν* (Impf.) prob. implies a *continued* experience.

19-20. The defeat of Satan explains the success of the disciples. Jesus has given them authority over all the powers of evil. The language is coloured by Ps. xci. But Jesus directs their thoughts away from their sensational successes. The real ground for joy is that they are enrolled in God's book as citizens of the kingdom, which, with Satan's downfall, is shortly to be revealed. The idea of God's book is found in O.T., Ex. xxxii. 32; Is. iv. 3. See also Enoch xlvii. 3, and esp. Dan. xii. 1.

21-22. These words with insignificant variations are also found in Mt. xi. 25-27 and therefore derive from a common source (Q). In Mt. they are followed by the invitation 'Come unto me all ye that labour . . .' Did the invitation follow the two preceding verses in Q as in Mt.? If so, it is remarkable that Lk., who cared much for the weary and heavy-laden, should omit it. There is a study of these verses in Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 277 f. Norden holds that the integral text is preserved in Mt. The three stanzas (Mt. xi. 25-26; 27; 28-29), each consisting of four lines, must go together. They reproduce a type of religious *ῥῆσις* containing the three elements of (1) revelation, (2) thanks-

τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ κύριε τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ
συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναί, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι
22 οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου. Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη

giving for the revelation, (3) invitation to share in the revelation. This common type underlies the last chapter of Ecclus., *Corp. Herm.* i. fin., and this *logion* in the Gospels. Distinctive of the Christian treatment of the theme is the idea that the revelation is imparted to the simple and childlike. The sayings are to be ascribed to an early Christian 'prophet.' Though not an αὐτοφωνία of the Lord, they are true to the 'idea' of his teaching and character. Norden finds himself unable to account for Luke's omission of Mt. xi. 28-29. It may be suggested that Lk. modified the source with a view to the setting in which he has placed it, i.e. the occasion of the return of the seventy disciples. A general invitation to the weary and heavy-laden would be less appropriate here than *vv.* 23-24, which Lk. probably transferred from another context in Q (= Mt. xiii. 16, 17): Jesus 'privately' addresses the disciples and pronounces them blessed because they actually behold the fulfilment of what prophets and kings had looked for.

21. The words of introd. are characteristically Lucan: ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, cf. ii. 38, vii. 21, xii. 12, xiii. 31, xx. 19, xxiv. 33; Ac. xvi. 18, xxii. 13. ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πν. τ. ἁγ.] Cf. i. 47. Mt. xi. 25 begins: ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ (likewise characteristic of Mt.) ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν.

ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι] 'I thank thee.' The word is freq. in this sense in the Greek Psalter for Heb. הודו ל.

ἀπέκρυψας . . . καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας] The paratactic construction echoes Semitic idiom. The emphasis falls upon ἀπεκάλυψας: 'God has revealed to babes things hidden from the wise and prudent.' In thought and in language this passage is strikingly similar to 1 Cor. i. 21 ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν, εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σῶσαι τοὺς πιστεύοντας. But the use of νήπιοι here is quite different from the Pauline use. In Paul νήπιοι is used for immature believers (1 Cor. iii. 1), not, as here, for those who are unsophisticated.

ταῦτα] The content of ταῦτα is left vague, but may be interpreted as the knowledge of God's will. Perhaps in some earlier setting the reference of ταῦτα was more clearly defined.

ἔμπροσθέν σου] A Semitic periphrasis to avoid a too familiar manner in speaking of the Divine purpose.

22. πάντα μοι παρεδόθη] The meaning is not certain. Some interpret 'all power has been committed to me (as Messiah) by my Father.' Cf. Mt. xxviii. 18 ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία. But the thought of Messianic authority does not fit closely with the context. Wellh., Norden, Harnack interpret of the παράδοσις of religious doctrine, 'all that I teach has been delivered to me directly from my Father.' Jesus has not, like the scribes, received a παράδοσις from men. Therefore it is that he teaches with authority and not as the scribes. The scribes are 'the wise and prudent' from whom his wisdom has been hidden. This gives a good sense, but perhaps presses unduly and somewhat prosaically the associations of παρεδόθη, which need not mean more than 'committed.' The emphatic words

ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἂν

are ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, 'all that has been committed to me comes from my Father.' The concluding prayer in *Corp. Herm.* i. (Poimandres) gives a close parallel to παρεδόθη: εὐλογητὸς εἶ πάτερ· ὁ σὸς ἄνθρωπος συναγιάζειν σοι βούλεται, καθὼς παρέδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν.

γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός] Mt. ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱόν. The indirect question is prob. a stylistic alteration by Luke. The affirmation of the mutual knowledge of Father and Son has no parallel elsewhere in the synoptic Gospels. The absolute use of the term ὁ υἱός is found elsewhere in the synoptic traditions only in Mk. xiii. 32. On the other hand the thought and the language is in line with St. John's Gospel; cf. esp. x. 15 καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα. There is a general tendency among recent editors to hear in these words as they stand echoes of the thought of the early Church about its Lord and his relations with the Father, rather than echoes of actual words of Jesus. A difference is to be noted from the preceding verse: there it is the Father who 'reveals,' here the Son 'reveals' the Father. That in fact 'the Son' had revealed the Father was clear to the early believers. It is a further question whether an explicit claim to be, as the Son, sole revealer of the Father is probable on the lips of Jesus. There is some difficulty in interpreting the connexion of thought. The second clause—'no one knows who is the Son but the Father'—seems to interrupt the sequence between the first and the two last clauses. The revelation of the Father to the Son explains how no one knows the Father except the Son and those to whom the Son wills to reveal him, but that no one except the Father knows the Son breaks that line of thought. In many early quotations (reviewed in detail by Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, Excursus i.) the two clauses are cited in inverse order. This inversion of order is not attested by any MS. authority (the only important MS. variant is that of *a* who omits the clause concerning the knowledge of the Son by the Father), but Harnack thinks that the inverted order, with the reading ἔγνω for γινώσκει (see below), gives an earlier form of text than that attested by the MSS. It is, however, clear that with this inversion we are left with an impossible connexion between the two last clauses; it is hardly possible to say 'no one knows who the Son is except the Father and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him.' The Son is not his own revealer. Harnack thus holds that originally in Lk. (and therefore in Q) the words τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ were wanting. The residual text may then be regarded as an authentic saying. Wellh. also thinks it probable that the words concerning the Father's knowledge of the Son are an ancient interpolation. But it is precarious to desert the evidence of the MSS. The text as it stands gives a good sense, though there is certainly a hiatus in the thought between the first two clauses. It seems not unlikely that this hiatus was responsible for the inversion of order (conscious or unconscious) in so many early quotations. The reading ἔγνω for γινώσκει found in many early quotations (cf. Harnack *l.c.*) and in *a b* (*novit*), and adopted by

23 *βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι. Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς
μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέ-*
24 *ποντες ἃ βλέπετε. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ
βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ
ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.*

24 *και ακουσαι . . . ουκ ηκουσαν* om a i l

some heretics "qui peritiores apostolis volunt esse" (Iren. IV. xi. 1) in an anti-Judaic sense, may have arisen from assimilation to the aorist *παρεδόθη*. Harnack on the other hand suggests that *ἔγνω* was supplanted by *γινώσκει* because *ᾧ ἂν ἀποκαλύψῃ* seemed to demand the present tense in the preceding verb.

Norden holds fast to the four clauses. Not only is the full text attested by textual evidence, but the four clauses are required to balance the four clauses in the preceding verse. He recognizes that the second clause (b) interrupts the connexion between the first (a) and the third (c). The real force of (b), however, is that it provides the presupposition of (c): the Son knows, and can therefore reveal, the Father, but only because he is himself first known of the Father. On this interpretation, the thought is the same as that of Gal. iv. 9 *νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ*, 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12. Cf. also *Corp. Herm.* x. 15. The knowledge of man by God is antecedent to the knowledge of God by man. But the language, as Bousset points out, is against this. We require on this view, not 'no one knows the Son but the Father,' but 'the Father knows (*i.e.* foreknows, chooses) no one but the Son.' It is best to take the text as it stands and to interpret it of the mutual understanding between the Father and the Son, as often in St. John.

23-24. The connexion of the verses here, though probably not original, is better than in Mt. xiii. 16-17 where they are interpolated between the parable of the sower and its interpretation.

24. *καὶ βασιλεῖς*] Mt. *καὶ δίκαιοι*, which is less forcible. Mt. has a preference for *δικαιοσύνη*. The saying implies that the hopes and anticipations of the old dispensation are already finding their fulfilment in the work of Jesus on earth.

## The Good Samaritan (x. 25-37)

This is one of a small group of stories peculiar to Luke which give practical illustrations of types of conduct which are enjoined or reproved. Other such stories are 'The Rich Fool' (xii. 16-21) and 'Dives and Lazarus' (xvi. 19-31). A closer parallel to this story is 'The Pharisee and the Publican' (xviii. 9-14} which Jülicher thinks may originally have formed a pair with 'The Good Samaritan.' 'The Rich Fool' and 'The Pharisee and the Publican' are called by Luke 'parables.' But these stories are not parables in the usual sense of that word in the Gospels. The usual parable describes some natural process or some happening in social life which presents an analogy to a spiritual truth. The point of the parable lies in the analogy, not in the story itself. Indeed the narrator may find analogies to spiritual truths in behaviour or motives which, in themselves, are not, and are not regarded as, commendable; e.g. the parables of the unjust judge, the importunate friend, the unjust steward. In the case, however, of these illustrative stories, the story itself conveys its moral. The point of the present story lies in the beneficence of one of the schismatic Samaritans contrasted with the callous indifference of the representatives of official Judaism. It would thus be especially congenial to Luke, who loves to strike the universalistic note.

Whence Luke derived this and the other stories remains quite uncertain. There are indications that the present setting is secondary. The introductory dialogue with the lawyer is closely similar to Mk. xii. 28-34 and is either modelled upon that passage or else reproduces some parallel version. That Luke regarded it as a doublet of Mk. xii. 28 f. is shewn by his omission of that passage at xx. 40. The connexion with the parable is artificial, for the parable is not strictly an answer to the scribe's question. The scribe asks for a definition of what is meant by 'neighbour,' when it is said that a man must love his neighbour as himself. In the quotation from the law and in the scribe's question, the neighbour is mentioned as the proper *object* of benevolent action. The parable, it is true, gives by implication an answer to the question, viz. your neighbour is anyone in need with whom you are thrown into contact, but the word neighbour is now used in a quite different sense, viz. to denote the person who himself shews benevolence or 'neighbourliness' to others.

Halévy (*Revue des Études juives*, iv., 1882, pp. 249-255) argues that it is unlikely that Jesus would single out a Samaritan as a type of benevolent behaviour (he compares Mt. x. 5), and thinks the picture of a Samaritan on the road between Jerusalem and Jericho and on terms of intimacy with an innkeeper incompatible with the relations of Jews and Samaritans in Palestine in the period before the Jewish War. He thinks that the parable as spoken by Jesus may have contrasted 'Israelite' (in the sense of 'layman' as often in Rabbinic) with the priest and Levite, and that the conversion of the layman into a Samaritan may be ascribed to the universalism of Luke. Halévy's conjecture is favourably regarded by Montefiore, but not by Abrahams (*Studies*, 2nd Series, No. vii.).

It is likely that the story has had a history, and we should probably think of more stages than one before the tale received the artistic symmetry of its present form. The idiomatic vocabulary and artistic finish of verses 30-35 (see notes) seem to point to the present form of the story having been actually composed in the language in which we now read it. Halévy's conjecture that the Samaritan nationality of the good man is not an original feature of the tale might be supported by the story of the ten lepers (*c.* xvii.), where the *motif* of a grateful Samaritan who puts Jews to shame seems to have been superimposed upon an earlier story of healing.

25 Καὶ ἰδοὺ νομικός τις ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτὸν λέγων
Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ὁ δὲ
26 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀνα-
27 γινώσκεις; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ἈΓΑΠΉϹΕΙϹ ΚΎΡΙΟΝ ΤῸΝ ΘΕΌΝ
ϹΟΥ ἘΞ ὍΛΗϹ ΚΑΡΔΊΑϹ ϹΟΥ ΚΑῚ ἘΝ ὍΛῌ Τῌ͂ ΨΥΧῌ͂ ϹΟΥ ΚΑῚ ἘΝ ὍΛῌ Τῌ͂
ἸϹΧΎΙ ϹΟΥ ΚΑῚ ἘΝ ὍΛῌ Τῌ͂ ΔΙΑΝΟΊᾼ ϹΟΥ, *καὶ* ΤῸΝ ΠΛΗϹΊΟΝ ϹΟΥ ὩϹ
28 ϹΕΑΥΤΌΝ. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Ὀρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης· ΤΟΥ͂ΤΟ ΠΟΊΕΙ ΚΑῚ
29 ΖΉϹῌ. Ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν
30 Καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον; ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
Ἄνθρωπός τις κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ εἰς Ἰερειχὼ καὶ

25. *νομικός*] Six or seven times in Lk. Never in Mk. The only occurrence in Mt. is xxii. 35 (the parallel to Mk. xii. 28 f. closely answering to this passage), but there it is probably not the original reading. See Streeter, p. 320. The word is found not infreq. in papyri and inscrr. for 'a lawyer.' See M.M. *s.v.* The Gentile Luke tends to substitute it for the Jewish *γραμματεύς*.

*ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν*] So also in Mt. xxii. 35. But in Mk. xii. 28 the scribe speaks in all good faith. In Mt. and Mk. the scribe asks Jesus direct which is the first commandment in the law. In Lk. the reference to the law is subordinate to a more general question which would appeal more readily to readers who were not themselves under the law. Here and throughout the paragraph the dialogue in Lk. is artificial.

27. The combination of Deut. vi. 4 and Lev. xix. 18 is not here presented, as in Mk., as originating with Jesus, but is accepted by Jesus from the mouth of the scribe. The combination of the two commands to love God and to love your neighbour is already present in *Test. XII. Patr.*, Issachar v. 2, vii. 5, Dan v. 3.

28. *τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ*] The words look back to the scribe's question, *v.* 25. But there is perhaps also a reminiscence of Lev. xviii. 5 (cf. Gal. iii. 12).

29. *δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτόν*] To justify his question. The apparently simple answer which Jesus has elicited requires interpretation before it can be acted upon. Abrahams and Montefiore show clearly that many Jewish precedents can be found for the principle of universal benevolence. But "the desire for sharp definition is genuinely rabbinic" (J. Weiss).

30. *ὑπολαβών*] 'answering him.' Class. In Bible here, above twenty times in Job, and twice in Daniel, iii. 9, 95 (28). *ἀπὸ Ἰερουσάλημ*] The road from Jerusalem to Jericho was 'rocky and deserted' (Jos. *B.J.* IV. viii. 3). According to Jerome (on Jer. iii. 2) the road was infested with Arab robbers down to his own day.

*λῃσταῖς περιέπεσεν, οἳ καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν καὶ πληγὰς
ἐπιθέντες ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ. κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ* 31
*ἱερεύς τις κατέβαινεν [ἐν] τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν
ἀντιπαρῆλθεν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευείτης κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐλθὼν* 32
*καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν. Σαμαρείτης δέ τις ὁδεύων ἦλθεν* 33
*κατ᾽ αὐτὸν καὶ ἰδὼν ἐσπλαγχνίσθη, καὶ προσελθὼν κατ-* 34
*έδησεν τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ ἐπιχέων ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον, ἐπι-
βιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτῆνος ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς
πανδοχεῖον καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον* 35
*ἐκβαλὼν δύο δηνάρια ἔδωκεν τῷ πανδοχεῖ καὶ εἶπεν Ἐπι-
μελήθητι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτι ἂν προσδαπανήσῃς ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ
ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι. τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν* 36
*πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς λῃστάς;
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ* 37
*[ὁ] Ἰησοῦς Πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποίει ὁμοίως.*

31 om *εν* B 1 37 om *ο* B

*οἵ καί*] 'who, as you would expect.' This idiomatic relative, the frequent participial constructions, and the distinctive vocabulary leave the impression that the story as it stands is not written in translation Greek.

*ἐκδύσαντες*] The robbers first possess themselves of the valuable loot of the traveller's clothes, and then proceed to mishandle him, lest he cause them trouble.

31. *κατὰ συγκυρίαν*] Here only in N.T. The noun is quoted twice from Hippocrates (Hobart, 30), where it takes the place of the commoner *συγκύρησις, συγκύρημα*.

*ἱερεύς τις*] Returning perhaps to his home after fulfilling the duties of his course in the Temple. *ἀντιπαρῆλθεν*] A rare compound. 'Passed by on the other side.'

33. *Σαμαρείτης*] A lay man, and a schismatic at that.

34. *ἐπιχέων ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον*] Attested as a common remedy both among Greeks (Theophr. *Hist. Plant.* ix. 11. 1) and Jews (see reff. in S.B. on Mt. vi. 17, vol. i. p. 428. 2). *ἐπιβιβάσας*] Peculiar to Lk. in N.T. Cf. xix. 35, Ac. xxiii. 24. Class. and LXX.

*πανδοχεῖον*] Phryn. cclxxvi. *πανδοχεῖον οἱ διὰ τοῦ χ λέγοντες ἁμαρτάνουσι· διὰ γὰρ τοῦ κ χρὴ λέγειν πανδοκεῖον καὶ πανδοκεὺς καὶ πανδοκευτρία.* ℵ spells with a *κ* here.

35. *ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με*] Not 'after my return,' which would be *ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθεῖν με* (cf. xix. 15 and iii. 21), but 'on my way back.' Lk. appears regularly to respect the distinction between present and aorist in this construction. *ἐν τῷ* c. infin. of time echoes Hebraic idiom. Cf. Blass, § 71. 7, to which Moulton (citing Dr. E. A. Abbott), *Proleg.*$^2$ p. 249, assents. The sentence as a whole is very well articulated. In spite of the Hebraic flavour, it does not read like translation Greek. The compound *προσδαπανᾶν* here only in N.T.; *ἐπανέρχεσθαι* only here and xix. 15. Class. LXX.

37. *ὁ ποιήσας κτλ.*] The scribe

38 *Ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς κώμην
τινά· γυνὴ δέ τις ὀνόματι Μάρθα ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν
39 οἰκίαν. καὶ τῇδε ἦν ἀδελφὴ καλουμένη Μαριάμ, [ἣ] καὶ
παρακαθεσθεῖσα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ κυρίου ἤκουεν τὸν
40 λόγον αὐτοῦ. ἡ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλὴν δια-
κονίαν· ἐπιστᾶσα δὲ εἶπεν Κύριε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἡ ἀδελφή
μου μόνην με κατέλειπεν διακονεῖν; εἰπὸν οὖν αὐτῇ ἵνα
41 μοι συναντιλάβηται. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ κύριος
Μάρθα Μάρθα, μεριμνᾷς καὶ θορυβάζῃ περὶ πολλά, ὀλίγων
42 δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἑνός· Μαριὰμ γὰρ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα
ἐξελέξατο ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτῆς.*

39 om *η* ℵ*B³LΞ 41 *μεριμνας και θορυβαζη περι πολλα*] *θορυβαζη* D: om a b e syr.sin Amb *ολιγων δε εστιν χρεια η ενος*] pap³ ℵBC²L 1 33 579 syr.hl-mg boh aeth Or ½ Bas: *ολιγων δε εστι χρεια* 38 boh^cod arm pal: *ενος δε εστι χρεια* AC al pler f q vg syrr(cur.vg.hl-txt) ϛ: om D a b c e syr.sin Amb
42 *γαρ*] ℵBL 1 69 157: *δε* AC al pler f q syr.vg ϛ: om D a b c e vg syr.vt arm Amb

avoids the hated name of Samaritan. But his answer also throws into relief the centre and point of the story and leads easily to the final word of Jesus.

38-42. This incident is peculiar to Luke. The two sisters Martha and Mary appear here only in the synoptic Gospels. Acc. to John xi. 1 Mary was she who anointed the Lord at supper before his Passion, and the home of the sisters with their brother Lazarus was at Bethany. Luke is quite vague as to locality, *κώμην τινά v.* 38, but the Lord cannot be thought of as being now near to Jerusalem. The characters of the two sisters as represented in John are true to the picture in the present story.

39. *παρακαθεσθεῖσα*] i.e. as a pupil. Mary fulfils the ideal of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 35 *εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως*. Martha, like the married woman in St. Paul, *μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου* (*ib. v.* 34).

40. *περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν*] Cf. Jo. xii. 2 *καὶ ἡ Μάρθα διηκόνει.*

41-42. The general sense of these verses is clear. Martha's distraction is gently reproved; Mary in choosing to sit and listen has chosen well and is not to be robbed of her choice. But the reading is very uncertain. If the reading of D lat.vt syr.sin may be taken as original we have a clear sense, and the other readings may be accounted for as interpretative glosses, or a combination of glosses. The objection to this is that we must assume that in this case the great Uncials ℵB give a very early conflation of readings which have been better preserved in other lines of transmission. If we read *ἑνὸς δέ ἐστι χρεία* with AC syr.cur we may interpret *ἑνός* either as 'one dish' in antithesis to *πολλά*, or, better, in a 'spiritual' sense of the 'one thing necessary to salvation'; cf. Mk. x. 21 *ἕν σε ὑστερεῖ* = Lk. xviii. 22 *ἔτι ἕν σοι λείπει.* If we read *ὀλίγων* the reference must be to dishes. The reading *ὀλίγων . . . ἢ ἑνός* does not appear to yield a tolerable sense.

### On Prayer (xi. 1-13)

There is no close connexion between this and the preceding paragraph. As in the last section the topography is quite vague. Cf. *εἰς κώμην τινά* x. 38 with *ἐν τόπῳ τινί* xi. 1.

Jesus first teaches his disciples a pattern prayer. The pattern prayer is paralleled—with important variations—in Mt. vi. 9-13. The introductory sentence is peculiar to Luke. As it stands the verse bears characteristic marks of Lucan style, but it seems unlikely that it does not reproduce some earlier source—probably Q. The likeness and the difference between the two leaders, John and Jesus, reflects the actual juxtaposition of two kindred but not entirely harmonious groups. Cf. Mk. ii. 18 f. || Lk. v. 33 f. That John and Jesus should teach their disciples a prayer would be in accordance with Jewish usage. "It was customary for a famous Rabbi to compose a special prayer" (Montefiore). It is remarkable that Mk. does not record 'the Lord's Prayer' as an integral whole, though parallels to most of its clauses are to be found in other connexions in his Gospel. The Matthaean version is fuller than the Lucan and probably reflects the influence of liturgical usage upon a simpler form similar to that given in Lk. The obscure word *ἐπιούσιος* common to Mt. and Lk. points clearly to some common Greek source—probably Q—unless we follow Streeter's bold and unsupported conjecture that the texts of Lk. have been corrupted by assimilation to Mt. (p. 277 n. 1). That Luke preserves the actual form and order of a single prayer imparted by Jesus is naturally more than we can prove. In any case the Prayer stands in close harmony with the leading thoughts of the teaching of Jesus. Parallels from Jewish prayers as well as distinctive features of 'the Lord's Prayer' are admirably discussed in Abrahams (*Studies*, 2nd Series No. xii.).

After the Lord's Prayer Lk. gives the parable of the importunate friend, which is peculiar to himself. There is affinity in form and in teaching between this parable and the parable of the widow and the unrighteous judge (likewise peculiar to Lk.), though the eschatological reference of the latter parable is not here present. Perhaps the two originally formed a pair (see on xviii. 1 f.). The moral of the parable—that men should be importunate in prayer—reflects a different mood and temper from the teaching of Mt. vi. 7, "Make not vain repetitions."

XI. 1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ προσευχό-
μενον, ὡς ἐπαύσατο, εἶπέν τις τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς
αὐτόν Κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ
2 Ἰωάνης ἐδίδαξεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς
Ὅταν προσεύχησθε, λέγετε Πάτερ, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά
3 σου· ἐλθάτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιού-

2 Πατερ sine addit ℵBL 1 22 700 al pauc vg syr.sin arm Tert Orig Cyr : add ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις ACD al pler lat.vet (habent pro ημων *sancte* a c ff$^2$ i) syr(cur.vg) aegg ϛ    το ονομα σου] D add εφ ημας    ελθατω η βασιλεια σου] ελθετω το πνευμα σου το αγιον εφ ημας και καθαρισατω ημας 700 162 Greg-Nyss Maxim (vide adnot): add γενηθητω το θελημα σου ως εν ουρανω και επι [της] γης ℵACD al pler lat.vet syr (vg.hl) boh ϛ : γενηθητω το θελημα σου a sah boh$^{codd}$: sine addit BL 1-22 vg syr.vet arm Orig Cyr Tert Aug

1. Note the characteristic Lucan constr. ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ . . . εἶπεν . . . Lk. loves to picture Christ at prayer, cf. iii. 21 n. At v. 33 Lk. has already remarked, in an interpolation into the Marcan source, that the disciples of John 'make prayers.' The disciple asks that he and his fellows may be guided by their Master in prayer.

2-4. The wording of the first, second, and last petitions is verbally identical with Mt. vi. 9 f., and the differences from Mt. in the third and fourth are not great. In the majority of MSS. the third and last Matthaean petitions have been interpolated into the text. The interesting substitute for the second petition, "let thy holy spirit come upon us and cleanse us," attested by Greg. Nyss., Maximus, and two cursive MSS., has been thought to be original. It would fit well with the Lucan reading πνεῦμα ἅγιον in *v.* 13. So Harnack, Streeter, and more doubtfully Wellh. Harnack drastically proposes to substitute it for the first two petitions. But for such a text there is no positive evidence. It is further to be noted that the textual evidence is less homogeneous than Streeter states; in Marcion *apud* Tert. *adv. Marc.* iv. 26 the words or their equivalent were a substitute for the first, not for the second petition. On the whole the text of the best MSS. may be accepted as original with considerable confidence. Perhaps the variant originated, as Burkitt suggests, in the liturgical usage of the Marcionites. *J.Th.S.* xxvi. p. 290.

2. Πάτερ] Mt. adds ἡμῶν and the characteristic expansion ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. In Gethsemane (Mk. xiv. 36) Jesus himself prays Ἀββᾶ, πάτερ. Prayer to God as Father is deeply rooted in Christian practice. Cf. Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 17. The collocation of Ἀββᾶ πάτερ may carry us back to the earliest Church at Jerusalem when Aramaic-speaking and Greek-speaking congregations of believers worshipped side by side, and their usage in St. Paul's epistles very likely at once suggested to those who read the words some form of 'the Lord's Prayer.' Cf. Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, pp. 23 f. Prayer to God as Father, though scarcely dominant as in the Christian Church, was in common use in the Jewish synagogue. Thus the sixth of the 'eighteen benedictions': "Forgive

σιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν· καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρ- 4
τίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν·
καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. Καὶ 5
εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἕξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσε-

4 add αλλα ρυσαι ημας απο του πονηρου ACD al pler lat.vet syrr(cur.vg.hl) boh$^{\text{codd}}$ ϛ : om ℵBL 1-22-131 700 al pauc vg syr.sin arm aegg Orig Cyr Tert Aug

us, O our Father, for we have sinned: pardon us, O our king, for we have transgressed" (*Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, ed. Abrahams, pp. 46, lv). ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου] Cf. the 'third benediction,' called in the Mishna 'the sanctification of the name': "Thou art holy and thy name is holy, and holy beings praise thee daily" (*op. cit.* p. 45). ἐλθάτω ἡ βασιλεία σου] The characteristic petition of the Church, cf. *Did.* x. But it is rooted in the faith of Israel.

3. ἐπιούσιον] The meaning of this word (common to Mt. and Lk.) is quite uncertain. It was already obscure to Origen, *De Or.* xxvii. 15 παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε τῶν σοφῶν ὠνόμασται οὔτε ἐν τῇ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν συνηθείᾳ τέτριπται, ἀλλ' ἔοικε πεπλάσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν. But Origen was wrong in thinking the word was coined by the evangelists. An unquestionable ex. of the word in a secular document is found in Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griech. Urkunden aus Ägypten*, i. no. 5224 (cf. Debrunner in *Th. Lit. Zeit.*, 1925, p. 119), but the document is too fragmentary to throw any light at all upon the meaning of the word. The most prob. derivation is from ἡ ἐπιοῦσα, sc. ἡμέρα, 'the coming day.' This seems to have been the interpretation of the Gosp. acc. to Hebr. (*apud* Jer. in Mt. vi. 11), "Mahar, quod dicitur crastinum." δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν] Mt. δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, which is likely to be more primitive. δός harmonises with the other aorists. The present tense in Lk. fits τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν 'day by day.'

4. καὶ ἄφες . . . ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν] The thought is slightly different in Mt.: καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν. The disciple has already forgiven (perfect) and can therefore now ask the Father to forgive him, cf. Mt. xviii. 35. Lk.'s version is more general: "Forgive us our sins, for we forgive every one who is indebted to us." In this and in other respects Lk. appears to be less primitive. ἁμαρτίας is a stylistic improvement for ὀφειλήματα, which, however, somewhat obscures the parallelism between the clauses. παντὶ ὀφείλοντι is Lucan, cf. vi. 30, 40, xiv. 11, xviii. 14.

εἰς πειρασμόν] To be interpreted generally of a situation which involves especially grave temptation to sin. S.B. i. 422 quote *Ber.* 60 b "Bring me not into the power of sin, nor into the power of guilt, nor into the power of temptation." A direct reference here to eschatological woes does not seem likely.

5. τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν] Cf. *v.* 11 *infra*, xii. 25, xiv. 28, xv. 4, xvii. 7. The parallels are in favour of regarding τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν as the subject whose behaviour to his friend (*v.* 8) gives the point of the parable. There is thus an awkward change of subject between ἕξει and πορεύσεται. The

*ται πρὸς αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ Φίλε, χρῆσόν*
6 *μοι τρεῖς ἄρτους, ἐπειδὴ φίλος μου παρεγένετο ἐξ ὁδοῦ*
7 *πρός με καὶ οὐκ ἔχω ὃ παραθήσω αὐτῷ· κἀκεῖνος ἔσωθεν*
*ἀποκριθεὶς εἴπῃ Μή μοι κόπους πάρεχε· ἤδη ἡ θύρα*
*κέκλεισται, καὶ τὰ παιδία μου μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὴν κοίτην*
8 *εἰσίν· οὐ δύναμαι ἀναστὰς δοῦναί σοι. λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ καὶ*
*οὐ δώσει αὐτῷ ἀναστὰς διὰ τὸ εἶναι φίλον αὐτοῦ, διά γε*
*τὴν ἀναιδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐγερθεὶς δώσει αὐτῷ ὅσων χρῄζει.*
9 Κἀγὼ *ὑμῖν λέγω, αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε,*
10 *καὶ εὑρήσετε· κρούετε, καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν. πᾶς γὰρ*
*ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει, καὶ τῷ κρούοντι*
11 *ἀνοιγήσεται. τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει ὁ*
12 *υἱὸς ἰχθύν, μὴ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει; ἢ καὶ*
13 *αἰτήσει ᾠόν, ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον; εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονη-*
*ροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις*
*ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα*
*ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.*

8 *λεγω υμιν*] praem et ille si perseveraverit pulsans c ff$^2$ i l m vg 11 *ο υιος*] add *αρτον μη λιθον επιδωσει αυτω η* [*και*] (= Matt vii. 9) codd et verss paene omn ϛ : om B ff$^2$ i l syr.sin arm sah Orig Epiph$^{marc}$ 13 om *ο* ℵLX 33 *πνευμα αγιον*] *αγαθον δομα* D b c ff$^2$ i l codd ap Ambr Orig ⅔? : *πνευμα αγαθον* L al pauc vg syr.hl-mg Cyr : *αγαθα* syr.sin arm

meaning would have been better given by a conditional sentence *ἐὰν πορευθῇ*. The parataxis is Semitic. Cf. Blass, § 64. 6. *μεσονυκτίου*] The journey, as often in the East, is performed at night time to avoid the heat of the day.

7. *εἰς τὴν κοίτην*] *εἰς* for *ἐν*.

8. *διὰ τὴν ἀναιδίαν*] It is implied, though not stated, that the friend repeats his request. Cf. xviii. 4 (the parallel parable) *καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἐπὶ χρόνον*. Many MSS. of lat.vt. have supplied the omission.

9-13. || Mt. vii. 7-11. Verses 9, 10 are verbally identical with Mt. vii. 7, 8. The former verse bids men ask, seek, and knock. That they will be rewarded is certain, for the second verse affirms it to be a universal law that each of these three actions on the part of man meets with a corresponding response from God.

11. *τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα*] We pass from the relationship of friend to the closer relationship of Father and Son. In Mt. the correlatives are: bread—stone, fish—serpent; in Lk., fish—serpent, egg—scorpion.

13. *πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες*] Slightly stronger than *πονηροὶ ὄντες* Mt. Cf. xviii. 19, "None is good save one, God."

*πνεῦμα ἅγιον*] So in Lk. the Father's gift is defined. In Mt. we read *ἀγαθά*, which is more likely to be original.

### ON CASTING OUT DEVILS. A SIGN REFUSED (xi. 14-36)

Jesus vindicates himself against attacks. His cures are worked by the power of God, and not, as his critics allege, by an unholy league with the powers of evil. God through him is overthrowing the strongholds of Satan. To the demand for a sign he declares that no sign shall be given 'except the sign of Jonah.' His generation is condemned by its attitude to one in their midst who is more than Solomon and more than Jonah.

Except *vv.* 27, 28 ("Blessed is the womb that bare thee," etc.), and 33-36, the materials of these paragraphs occur in close connexion in Mt. xii. 22 f. It is reasonable to suppose that both Mt. and Lk. are reproducing Q, and perhaps probable that Lk. retains the order of Q. The first paragraph (14-22) is also represented in Mk. (iii. 22 f.), but this was certainly not the sole source of Mt. and Lk. A number of agreements between Mt. and Lk. against Mk. shew that there was also a common non-Marcan source. This dispute, therefore, was an integral part of two main bodies of tradition. The fundamental similarities between Mk. and Q (so far as it may be reconstructed) leave little doubt that there is affinity between the two earlier versions.[1] An early form of the story, we may suppose, was variously glossed in different lines of transmission represented respectively by Mk. and Q. See notes on *vv.* 19, 20, and also cf. xii. 10 (with note) where we find a parallel to Mk. iii. 28, 29 which is not here represented in Lk. and was probably not found in the Q version of this narrative. Mt. appears to have conflated Mk. and Q. Lk. may be supposed to have followed Q more closely. He has omitted the Marcan paragraph from its proper place above in *c.* vi.

Comparison with Mt. shews that Lk. has treated the substance of his sources with fairly close fidelity, but it is interesting to note his attempt to link his materials into a consecutive narrative. At *v.* 16 occurs what is at first sight an awkward interruption of the narrative: "Others tempting him sought of him a sign from heaven." This seems to have no sequel until the next paragraph. In Mt. (xii. 38) the equivalent to these words occurs, as we should expect in the introduction to the paragraph parallel to Lk. xi. 29 f. But, as Loisy notes, Luke's transposition is intentional. His purpose is to shew that Christ's healings of the possessed have the force of a sign to those who can read them aright (*v.* 20). When this has been made clear the way is prepared, without further introduction, for the denunciation of *v.* 29.

---

[1] Streeter, however (*Four Gospels*, p. 189), holds that verbal similarities between Lk. (=Q) and Mk. are "no more than would be inevitable if they represent two quite independent traditions of the same original incident and discourse." But this seems not to do justice to the fundamental similarity in *structure* between the two accounts.

14 *Καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ*
*δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. Καὶ ἐθαύμασαν*
15 *οἱ ὄχλοι· τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπαν Ἐν Βεεζεβοὺλ τῷ*
16 *ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια· ἕτεροι δὲ*
17 *πειράζοντες σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐζήτουν παρ' αὐτοῦ. αὐτὸς*
*δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Πᾶσα*
*βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται, καὶ οἶκος*
18 *ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει. εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη,*
*πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ὅτι λέγετε*
19 *ἐν Βεεζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια. εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεεζεβοὺλ*
*ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλ-*

14. In Mt. the possessed man is both blind and dumb. The actual healing is not mentioned in Mk. as the occasion of the dispute.

15. *τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν*] In Mk. the critics are scribes from Jerusalem, and in Mt. Pharisees. Lk. makes them 'some from the multitudes.' Cf. iii. 7 n. (with the parallel from Mt.). The critics do not question the reality of the cures, any more than Jesus himself questions the reality of the cures wrought by others (*v.* 19).

16. See Introd. and *v.* 29 n.

17. *εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα*] *εἰδὼς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν* Mt. Not in Mk. *οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον*] *διαμερισθείς* must be supplied. "A house divided against itself falls." This is clearly expressed in Mk. and Mt.

18. *ὅτι λέγετε κτλ.*] An interpretative statement not in Mt. and Mk.: prob. added by Lk. The constr. acc. and infin. is rare in the Gospels.

19. The charge that devils are cast out by the prince of the devils may be alleged with equal justice against the recognised exorcists, and they may be left to answer it. For the practice of exorcism among the Jews cf. esp. Jos. *Ant.* viii. 2. 5 *πάρεσχε δ' αὐτῷ (τῷ Σολόμωνι) μαθεῖν ὁ θεὸς καὶ τὴν κατὰ τῶν δαιμόνων τέχνην εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ θεραπείαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἐπῳδάς τε συνταξάμενος αἷς παρηγορεῖται τὰ νοσήματα καὶ τρόπους ἐξορκώσεων κατέλιπεν, οἷς οἱ ἐνδούμενοι τὰ δαιμόνια ὡς μηκέτ' ἐπανελθεῖν ἐκδιώξουσι. καὶ αὕτη μέχρι νῦν παρ' ἡμῖν ἡ θεραπεία πλεῖστον ἰσχύει.* There follows an instructive account of the extraction of demons from the afflicted by one Eleazar in the presence of Vespasian and his sons and officers. Cf. also Acts xix. 13 f.

Verses 19, 20 are found almost identically in Mt. (*πνεύματι* for *δακτύλῳ*). But they are not in Mk. The sequence of 19 and 20 raises the obvious difficulty that the appeal to the example of the Jewish exorcists followed by the assertion

λουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταὶ ἔσονται. εἰ δὲ ἐν 20
δακτύλῳ θεοῦ [ἐγὼ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν
ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθ- 21
ωπλισμένος φυλάσσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν
τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελθὼν 22
νικήσῃ αὐτόν, τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἴρει ἐφ᾽ ᾗ ἐπεποίθει,
καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν. ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ κατ᾽ 23
ἐμοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.
Ὅταν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 24
διέρχεται δι᾽ ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ μὴ
εὑρίσκον [τότε] λέγει Ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου
ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον· καὶ ἐλθὸν εὑρίσκει [σχολάζοντα,] σεσαρω- 25

22 ισχυροτερος sine artic ℵBDΘLΓ 700 Cyr: praem ο AC al pler Eus ϛ
24 ευρισκον] add τοτε (=Mt. xii. 44) BLXΞ 33 157: non add ℵACD unc rell
25 σχολαζοντα] add BCL 1 etc 579 al pauc f l syr.hl boh (Matt xii. 44): om ℵAD al pler latt syrr arm sah ϛ

that, if Jesus casts out devils by the finger of God, then the kingdom of God is come upon them, seems to require the admission that the success of the Jewish exorcists implies the same conclusion. This difficulty is in favour of Bultmann's hypothesis that the reference to the Jewish exorcists is a later insertion perhaps to be ascribed to the controversies of the early community with its Jewish opponents. Verse 20 Bultmann holds to be part of the original narrative. It connects well with 18a.

20. This is Jesus' own interpretation of his success. Though the kingdom is yet to come, it is nevertheless already operative when he acts.

21-22. Lk., perhaps following Q, is here much fuller than Mk. and Mt. In Mk. and Mt. the strong man is a householder. Lk. gives the picture of the strong man armed to defend his palace against attack, and then robbed of his panoply. The 'strong man' is Satan, the *de facto* ruler of the world, whose kingdom is being assaulted by the powers of the kingdom of God. The 'stronger' is either Jesus himself or, more probably, God.

22. τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσι] Cf. Is. liii. 12 τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα.

23. An appeal to those who hear to take sides with him against the powers of Satan. This saying is not in Mk., but is found in Mt. and therefore may be assigned to Q. In another connexion Jesus could say the converse. Cf. ix. 50 (=Mk. ix. 40).

24-26. || Mt. xii. 43-45 where the verses follow the denunciation of the evil and adulterous generation (=Lk. *vv.* 29-32). Mt. concludes with the words οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ πονηρᾷ, thus implying that the saying is to be regarded as a parable of the future apostasy of the Jewish people. This, as Wellh. says, is very artificial. The Lucan order probably comes from Q. But it is likely that the

26 μένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον. τότε πορεύεται καὶ παρα-
λαμβάνει ἕτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτά, καὶ εἰσ-
ελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ, καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
27 ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ
λέγειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα ἐπάρασά τις φωνὴν γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου
εἶπεν αὐτῷ Μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσασά σε καὶ
28 μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας· αὐτὸς δὲ εἶπεν Μενοῦν μακάριοι
οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φυλάσσοντες.

29 Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροιζομένων ἤρξατο λέγειν Ἡ γενεὰ
αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρά ἐστιν· σημεῖον ζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ

saying was not always attached to the narrative preceding. The most satisfactory interpretation seems to be that the saying conveys a warning to those who have been freed from possession by 'unclean spirits' to strengthen themselves in the power of God, lest they fall a victim once more to their old enemy who will return reinforced. The belief that the expelled spirits seek 'rest' in some body is well illustrated by the story of the Gerasene demoniac, viii. 32 f., and for the danger that they will return to their old home cf. Jos. quoted on *v.* 19.

27-28. We seem to have here a variant of the saying on the true kinsfolk of Jesus (Lk. viii. 19-21) which in Mk. follows closely on the sayings concerning 'casting out devils by Beelzebub' ( || Mt. xii. 46, 50).

28. μενοῦν] 'Nay rather.' The use of this enclitic at the beginning of a sentence is reproved by Phrynichus, cccxxii.

29-32. || Mt. xii. 38-42. This paragraph refers back to *v.* 16. In Mt. it is again the Scribes and Pharisees who, by their request for a sign, call forth the words of Jesus. Cf. also the similar passage in Mk. viii. 11-13 where the Pharisees ask for a sign. Lk.'s introduction is probably his own editing. He again gives the ὄχλοι as the background of the address. ἐπαθροίζεσθαι here only in N.T. But Lk. (and Lk. only) thrice uses συναθροίζεσθαι.

29. Lk. does not give the epithet μοιχαλίς, perhaps because the metaphor might not be understood.

εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ] In Mk. viii. 11 f. the request for a sign is unconditionally refused. The qualification of Mt. and Lk. εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ raises great difficulties. In the next verse the explanation is given that as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so the Son of Man shall be to this generation. This is very vague. It also connects badly with the preceding verse, for Jonah was not a sign to 'this generation,' but only an analogue to the sign that was granted. Mt. has another interpretation, which is also open to the last objection: the sign of Jonah is that he was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, which is an analogue to the Son of Man who shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. Wellh. and Loisy think that Lk. read this in Q and amended it, perhaps because it conflicted with his view of the chronology of the burial and

δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ. καθὼς γὰρ 30
ἐγένετο [ὁ] Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευείταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἔσται
καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. βασίλισσα 31
νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς
γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν
περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ
πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. ἄνδρες Νινευεῖται ἀναστήσονται 32
ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν
αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ
πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε. Οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἅψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθη- 33
σιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ

30 add D a e ff$^2$ *και καθως* (e sicut enim) *Ιωνας εν τη κοιλια του κητους εγενετο τρις ημερας και τρεις νυκτας ουτως και ο υιος του ανθρωπου εν τη γη* (cf. Matt xii. 40). e om totum v. 30   32 om D   33 *ουδε υπο τον μοδιον* om LΓΞ 1 etc 69 700 syr.sin arm sah

resurrection (Loisy), or perhaps because he stumbled at the allusion to the whale (Wellh.). Harnack, on the other hand, holds that had Lk. read Mt. xii. 40, he would not have left it out, and that therefore Lk. may be assumed to preserve the original reading of the source. A third and perhaps more probable hypothesis is that both Mt. xii. 40 and Lk. xi. 30 are independent glosses to explain the allusion. Dr. J. H. Michael argues very attractively in *J.Th.S.* xxi. (Jan. 1920) pp. 146 f. for a conjecture which, if it could be established, would meet the difficulty: Ἰωνᾶ, he suggests, is a very early corruption for Ἰωάνου due to the subsequent reference to Jonah. The original saying, then, was that the only sign to that generation was John the Baptist. This would harmonise admirably with Mk. xi. 27 f. For the confusion between the two names cf. Mt. xvi. 17 with Jo. xxi. 15.

31-32. The verses occur in reverse order in Mt. D omits *v.* 32. Harnack notes that μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς in *v.* 32 agrees with Mt. but not with μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τ. γ. τ. in *v.* 31, and argues that this is some support for the supposition that in Lk., *v.* 32 is an interpolation from Mt. On the other hand, the omission in D may be easily explained by homoioteleuton.

31. Lk. does not stumble at βασίλισσα. Cf. Phryn. ccii. βασιλίσσα· οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχαίων εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ βασίλεια ἢ βασιλίς.

33. This saying has been already taken over by Lk. (viii. 16) from Mk. There the Marcan form is amplified by the same concluding clause that is found here: ἵνα . . . βλέπωσι. The saying is also found in Mt. v. 15. κρύπτη] 'a cellar.' Not in the other evv., nor elsewhere in the N.T. Luke may have taken this saying with the preceding, and interpreted the light of Jesus: the light of Jesus shines openly in the world and no further sign is necessary. "The saying was a proverb taken over by the Christian tradition, and ready for any good use" (Loisy). οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον] Perhaps interpolated here from Mt.

34 εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν. Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός
ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου. ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἁπλοῦς ᾖ,
καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτινόν ἐστιν· ἐπὰν δὲ πονηρὸς
35 ᾖ, καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτινόν. σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ
36 ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν. εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτινόν,
μὴ ἔχον μέρος τι σκοτινόν, ἔσται φωτινὸν ὅλον ὡς ὅταν
ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ φωτίζῃ σε.

35, 36 substit Matt vi. 23 b D lat.vet: syr.cur habet Luc xi. 35 + Matt vi. 23 b; f q syr.sin habent Luc xi. 35 (f etiam v. 36) + fere if therefore thy body hath no lamp that shineth, it is darkened; how much more when the lamp shineth doth it lighten thee

34, 35. As the light of the body depends upon the eye, so, it is implied, does the light of man's life depend upon his heart (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί). Cf. Aristot. *Top.* i. 17, p. 108 a ὡς ὄψις ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ. Philo, *De op. mundi*, § 53. Perhaps the intended connexion with the preceding is: to see the light, even when set on the stand, an open eye is needed, with an implied reference to the unreceptive Jews. Or perhaps the connexion hangs merely on the parabolic use of λύχνος common to *v.* 33 and *v.* 34. The same saying is found in Mt. vi. 22-23. ἁπλοῦς . . . πονηρός] Cf. McNeile and Klostermann on Mt. vi. 22. πονηρός can be used of purely physical unsoundness, cf. class. πονηρῶς ἔχειν. But probably both ἁπλοῦς and πονηρός are used as readily applicable to describe moral conditions.

36. This verse is very obscure. The variants are probably to be explained as attempts to mend a difficulty. Some very early corruption may be suspected which is now irremediable. The plain translation gives an intolerably platitudinous meaning. Possibly the verse provided a conclusion linking together the two *logia* preceding: if the heart is truly receptive of light, it will receive light from the true light when it shines, that is from Christ. (Cf. Klostermann.)

## THE PHARISEES AND THE LAWYERS DENOUNCED (xi. 37-54)

These denunciations of the Pharisees and lawyers are all of them closely paralleled in Mt. xxiii., and may be presumed to come from Q. Matthew has conflated them with the briefer denunciation recorded in Mk. xii. 38, which Luke has left standing in its proper place at xx. 45 f. But the Matthaean denunciations are much longer than the Lucan, and the method of arrangement is entirely different. It is hard to decide whether Luke read a fuller version and has abbreviated, or whether, as Streeter prefers to think, Matthew has conflated Q (substantially reproduced by Luke) with another independent version, as well as with Mark. Much of the material in Matthew not found in Luke has a pronounced Jewish colouring, and would be of less interest to Luke's readers.

In Matthew, after some opening teachings with regard to the attitude of the disciples towards the practices of the scribes and Pharisees (*vv.* 1-12), we have a series of seven ‘woes.’ In Luke there are six ‘woes,’ of which three are pronounced upon Pharisees and three upon ‘lawyers’ (i.e. scribes). But there is something artificial about this arrangement. The dividing verse (45) is a somewhat clumsy division. Moreover the second ‘woe’ of the second series (v. 47 f.) does not appear to be especially appropriate to lawyers.

This second ‘woe’ on the lawyers occurs in Matthew at the conclusion of the whole section, where it leads on to the great lament over Jerusalem, which Luke has reserved for xiii. 34 f. Luke's conclusion is abrupt and much less impressive. The last ‘woe’ in Luke (“the lawyers have taken away the key of knowledge”) corresponds to the first of the seven ‘woes’ in Mt. (xxiii. 14).

The scene is laid by Luke at a Pharisee's dinner-table. That Jesus should choose such an occasion for his denunciation is certainly remarkable, but there can be little doubt that *vv.* 37, 38 is a setting provided by Luke. Cf. vii. 36 xiv. 1.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι ἐρωτᾷ αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖος ὅπως ἀρι- 37
στήσῃ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ· εἰσελθὼν δὲ ἀνέπεσεν. ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος 38
ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου.
εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι 39
τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ
δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἁρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. ἄφρονες, 40
οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν;

40 *το εξωθεν και το εσωθεν*] *το εσωθεν και το εξωθεν* CD a c e Cypr

37. *ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι*] Not ‘while he was speaking,’ but ‘after he had spoken,’ cf. ii. 27, x. 35 n.

38. *οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη*] The same omission is complained of on the part of the disciples, Mk. vii. That chapter, which is part of the section of Mk. not reproduced in Lk., very likely suggested this introduction.

39. *τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν*] The contrast lies between the outer cleansing of dishes and the inner cleansing of the heart. This is more intelligible than the contrast between the outside and the inside of the cup in Mt. xxiii. 25. Wellh. holds that *γέμουσι* in Mt. is a mistranslation of the Aramaic and should be *γέμετε*. J. Weiss, less probably, holds that Mt. gives the more original form: the dishes are full of extortion, because their contents are secured by hypocritical pretence. (The Pharisees ‘devour widows’ houses,’ Mk. xii. 40.) But such manner of speech seems too subtle for the gospel sayings.

40. If the ordinary reading is punctuated with a question mark (as in WH.) *ὁ ποιήσας* must be inter-

41 πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρὰ
42 ὑμῖν ἐστίν. ἀλλὰ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε
τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον, καὶ παρ-
έρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ· ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει
43 ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ παρεῖναι. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις,
ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ
44 τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς
τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ περιπατοῦντες
45 ἐπάνω οὐκ οἴδασιν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δέ τις τῶν νομικῶν λέγει
46 αὐτῷ Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα λέγων καὶ ἡμᾶς ὑβρίζεις. ὁ δὲ
εἶπεν Καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς οὐαί, ὅτι φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀν-
θρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἑνὶ τῶν δακτύλων

42 *ταυτα . . . παρειναι* om D

preted of God, 'he who created,' but the sense is far from clear. Wellh. follows D etc. in transposing ἔσωθεν and ἔξωθεν and interprets ποιεῖν as 'to put aright' as German *machen*, Eng. colloq. 'do' ('do the hair,' etc.), cf. 2 Regn. xix. 24. "Fools, he who has set aright what is within, hath he not also set aright what is without?"

41. A very obscure verse of which, as it stands, no satisfactory explanation is forthcoming. Wellh. thinks that δότε ἐλεημοσύνην is due to a translator who mistook Aram. *dakki* 'purify' for *zakki* 'give alms.' The conjecture is supported by Matthew, who gives καθάρισον.

42. τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ] i.e. the two chief commandments, cf. x. 25 *supra*. With the exception of Mt. xxiv. 12 this is the only passage in the synoptists where the noun ἀγάπη occurs. Mt. xxiii. 23 gives τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν. ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει . . . παρεῖναι] Possibly interpolated from Mt. xxiii. 23. See crit. note.

43. || Mt. xxiii. 6. See also below, xx. 46 (= Mk. xii. 38).

44. As the existence of the tomb with its defiling contents is not suspected, so men do not suspect what lies beneath the Pharisaic exterior. Mt. (xxiii. 27) gives a different point. The Pharisees are compared to 'whitened' tombs, with a reference to the custom of whitening the tombs before Passover in order that those who pass by might be warned to avoid defilement (cf. Abrahams, *Studies*, ii. pp. 29 f.). Thus the tombs in Mt. are not, as in Lk., ἄδηλα, and the contrast is between the fair exterior and its defiling contents. It is hard to decide whether Lk. has amended a reference to a custom which, perhaps, was not understood either by himself or his readers, or whether the Matthaean version is to be regarded as a secondary and interpretative comparison (so Wellh.). The former is perhaps more likely (so Loisy).

45. A highly artificial interruption, which serves to divide the two sets of denunciations. νομικῶν] Cf. x. 25 n.

46. || Mt. xxiii. 4. Luke has rewritten. δυσβάστακτα (Plut., Philo), προσψαύειν (class.), both literary words which do not occur elsewhere

ὑμῶν οὐ προσψαύετε τοῖς φορτίοις. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκο- 47
δομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν
ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε 48
τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν
αὐτοὺς ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ 49
θεοῦ εἶπεν Ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἀπο-
στόλους, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διώξουσιν, ἵνα ἐκ- 50
ζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ
καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, ἀπὸ αἵματος 51
Ἅβελ ἕως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ

48 *και συνευδοκειτε*] *μη συνευδοκειν* D lat.vt Lucif 49 *και η σοφια τ. θ. ειπεν* om D b Lucif

in N.T. The meaning is that the scribes, by means of their casuistical interpretation, know how to evade the burdens which they impose on others.

47-51. This 'woe' is not especially applicable to the *νομικοί*. The parallel in Mt. is somewhat longer and somewhat clearer (xxiii. 29-36). The fundamental thought is that the Pharisees only honour prophets who are dead. They, too, will slay the prophets whom God will send to them. Thus they are true sons of their fathers who slew the prophets of old. But the fundamental thought is somewhat obscured in *v.* 48. By building the tomb of a prophet you do not prove that you consent to the deed of those who killed him. With Loisy, the verse may be regarded as an "oratorical fiction, which accentuates somewhat violently what is read in Mt. (xxiii. 31-32 a)." In Mt. the thought runs: By priding yourselves on your superiority to your fathers, you yourselves testify that you are the sons of your fathers. Do you too fill up the measure of your fathers.

49. *ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν*] In Mt. the words following are directly spoken by Jesus; Jesus is the subject of *ἀποστέλλω*. The interpretation of the Wisdom of God here is uncertain. Some have supposed that we have a quotation from an apocryphal book (so still, Bultmann), but this does not seem likely. Christ himself is 'the wisdom of God' (1 Cor. i. 24), but he cannot speak of himself as such, and it is harsh to suppose, with Loisy, that Luke could understand him to do so. It is best to take the words as a periphrasis for God: "God, in his wisdom, said I will send . . ." This is in keeping with the general usage of the prophets and of the Gospels: it is God who sends. Cf. Jer. vii. 25; Is. vi. 8; Mk. xii. 2 f. But the abrupt introd. of *ἡ σοφία* in a quasi-personified sense must be admitted to be strange.

*προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους*] A Christianized version of the Jewish collocation of terms in Mt.: prophets and wise men and scribes. *ἀποκτενοῦσι καὶ διώξουσι*] Longer in Mt., who speaks of 'crucifying,' 'scourging in the synagogues,' and persecuting 'from city to city.'

50. *τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν*] Mt. *πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον*, which is more appropriate, for neither Abel nor Zechariah were strictly prophets.

51. *Ζαχαρίου*] If Wellh. (*Einlei-*

θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται
52 ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε
τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσ-
53 ερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε. Κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ

52 *ηρατε*] *εκρυψατε* D 157 lat.vt syr.vt arm 53-54 *λεγοντος δε ταυτα προς αυτους ενωπιον παντος του λαου ηρξαντο οι Φαρισαιοι και οι νομικοι δεινως εχειν και συνβαλλειν αυτω περι πλειονων ζητουντες αφορμην τινα λαβειν αυτον ινα ευρωσιν κατηγορησαι αυτου* D lat.vt. syr.vt (sin om *ινα . . . αυτου*)

*tung*, pp. 118 f.) is right in supporting the interpretation of Chrysostom and Grotius that the Zechariah here intended was Zechariah the son of Bariscaeus, an eminent and wealthy citizen of Jerusalem, who was slain by two zealots in the courts of the Temple A.D. 68 (Jos. *B.J.* iv. 5. 4), this passage must be dated after the Jewish war. Wellh. is followed among others by E. Meyer. But there seems no decisive objection to interpreting (with the *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews*) of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest, whose murder is described in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22. The addition in Mt. 'son of Barachiah' may be due to interpretation of the Zechariah who perished in the siege of Jerusalem, or, more probably, may be ascribed to confusion with Zechariah the prophet, the son of Berechiah (Zech. i. 1). That the reference is to the son of Jehoiada is well argued in McNeile, *St. Matthew*, p. 340, and it is accepted by Loisy. This interpretation appears to give a definitely better sense: all the righteous blood that has been shed upon the earth through the ages recorded in Scripture is to be required of this generation. But if Zechariah is the Zechariah who perished in the siege of Jerusalem under Titus, he himself belonged to 'this generation.' We read in 2 Chron. xxiv. 22 of the son of Jehoiada that "when he died, he said The Lord look upon it, and require it."

*μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου*] In the court of the priests before the Holy Place. This seems to be in favour of the son of Jehoiada the priest. See Zahn (*ad loc.*), who refers to discussions in Talmud and Midrash as to the court in which Zechariah the son of Jehoiada was killed, and the answer that it was in the court of the priests. The other Zechariah was slain *ἐν μέσῳ τῷ ἱερῷ* (Jos. *l.c.*), which does not mean more than in the midst of the Temple enclosure.

52. || Mt. xxiii. 14 *κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν.* The latter part of the verse in Lk. shews that a similar form of the saying lies behind the Lucan text. But in the former half, for 'kingdom of God' has been substituted *γνῶσις*. We may see Hellenistic influence here. *γνῶσις* occurs elsewhere in the Gospels only at Lk. i. 77. But cf. esp. 1 Cor. viii. 1 f., and see Preuschen-Bauer, *s.v.*

53-54. The reading of D etc. is preferred by Blass and Wellh. If this is right, the text of the best MSS. represents a correction to adapt the words to the situation supposed in *v.* 37. But the weight of textual evidence is in favour of the reading of WH., and the originality of this reading is supported by the rare words and unusual metaphor, which are not likely to be due to an interpolator.

*ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων, ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν* 54 *θηρεῦσαί τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.*

54 *ενεδρευοντες* [*αυτον*] . . . *στοματος αυτου* ℵBL 579 aegg aeth: add [*και*] *ζητουντες* post [*αυτον*] et postea *ινα κατηγορησωσιν αυτου* AC al pler vg syrr(vg.hl) ϛ

The tamer Western reading may be correction due to the influence of xii. 1 and Mt. xxiii. 1.

53. *ἐνέχειν*] Cf. Mk. vi. 19; Gen. xlix. 23. *χόλον* is to be understood. The full form *ἐνέχειν χόλον τινί* occurs in Herod. i. 118, vi. 119, viii. 27.

*ἀποστοματίζειν*] Here only in N.T. The proper meaning is 'to repeat by heart.' Cf. Plato, *Euthyd.* 276 c, 277 a. But this is not appropriate here. We require the meaning 'to question,' unless the word may be taken with Wellh. as equivalent to *ἐνεδρεύειν θηρεῦσαί τι* in the next verse. We may compare the improper use of *ἀπελπίζειν*, vi. 35.

54. *ἐνεδρεύειν*] Elsewhere in N.T. only Ac. xxiii. 21. *θηρεύειν*] Here only in N.T.

## WARNINGS TO THE DISCIPLES AND TO THE MULTITUDES (xii. 1-xiii. 9)

We have here a group of discourses loosely put together, in a framework which may be ascribed to the evangelist.

After a warning against 'the leaven of the Pharisees,' which connects with the preceding section, we pass on (*vv.* 2-12) to a collection of sayings which are to inspire and encourage the disciples in face of danger and opposition. They are in the hands of God, and need fear none else. Verses 2-9 occur in the same sequence in Mt. x., where they form part of the charge to the Twelve. No doubt each evangelist took the sayings from Q. Verse 10 occurs in another setting in Matthew and Mark. Verses 11-12 are peculiar to Luke.

Verses 13-21 give another illustrative story (cf. x. 25, Introd.) peculiar to Luke, which shews us the folly of covetousness. This leads on to another collection of sayings (*vv.* 22-53), which are intended to wean hearers from undue anxiety about the needs of this life. Their true treasure is to be found in God's kingdom. Let them be on the watch for the coming of the Son of Man; and let them be prepared for strife and division as the outcome of Christ's mission on earth. The former part of this discourse (*vv.* 22-31 and 33-34) occurs in Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 25-33, 19-21). Verses 39-46 are incorporated by Matthew with the eschatological discourse of Mk. xiii. in *c.* xxiv. Verses 51-53 form part of the charge to the Twelve in Mt. x. 34-36. Verses 35-38 and 47-50 are peculiar to Luke, and their *provenance* must remain doubtful.

At *v.* 54 Jesus addresses the multitudes. Let them discern the signs of the times, and let them take heed to settle their account with their adversary betimes, lest they fall under the condemnation of God. The parallel of *vv.* 58-59 with Mt. v. 25-26 is discussed in the notes.

The thought of judgement is still carried on over the next two paragraphs, both of which are peculiar to Luke. Some Galileans have been murderously killed by Pilate. Neither they, nor some Judaeans who have been killed by a falling tower in Siloam, must be supposed to have been sinners above the rest. A doom hangs over all unless they repent. The same moral is enforced by the subsequent parable of the unfruitful fig-tree.

XII. 1 Ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε
καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς
αὐτοῦ πρῶτον Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης, ἥτις ἐστὶν
2 ὑπόκρισις, τῶν Φαρισαίων. Οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον
ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.
3 ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται,

1. ἐν οἷς] i.e. while the machinations of the Pharisees were proceeding. The phrase occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in Ac. xxvi. 12.

πρῶτον] Wellh. wishes to omit with syr.sin b vg, but it is an unlikely interpolation. It is better taken (as in ℵ D etc., see Tisch.) with the words preceding, not (as by some other MSS. and some modern editors) as the first word of the address. Wellh. notes that in Lk. Jesus scarcely ever addresses the disciples alone; the multitude is almost always in the background. In this section Jesus begins to speak *first* to the disciples. At *v.* 13 one from the multitude interrupts and receives his answer. Then at *v.* 22 the moral is pressed home upon the disciples. Finally, at *v.* 54, the surrounding multitudes are addressed.

τῆς ζύμης . . . τῶν Φαρισαίων] This warning occurs in Mk. viii. 15 (i.e. part of the section of Mark left out by Luke) = Mt. xvi. 6, 11 f. Luke here makes the warning a transition from the denunciation of the Pharisees in the last section to sayings of *v.* 2 f. The 'leaven of the Pharisees' is not directly interpreted in Mk. In Mt. 'the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees' is said to be their 'teaching.' This is not quite what Mk. understood, for he speaks also of the 'leaven of Herod.' Lk. says that it is 'hypocrisy.'

2-3. The connexion as we read in Lk. is probably intended to be explained by the key-word ὑπόκρισις. "Beware of hypocrisy; all that is now covered shall come to light; what you say in darkness shall be spoken in light." In Mt. x. 26 f. the keyword 'hypocrisy' does not occur and a different turn is given to the sayings by reading ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν for ὅσα εἴπατε, ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς ἀκούετε for ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε, and imperatives εἴπατε, κηρύξατε for the passives ἀκουσθήσεται, κηρυχθήσεται. Thus the saying is an injunction to the disciples to proclaim boldly in public what has been learnt privately from Jesus. This gives a better connexion with what follows, and is perhaps more original than the Lucan version (so Harnack, Wellh.). Note the close parallelism in the form of these sayings. It is more exact in Mt.

καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις κηρυχθήσεται
ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβη- 4
θῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ
ἐχόντων περισσότερόν τι ποιῆσαι. ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα 5
φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν
ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν· ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε.
οὐχὶ πέντε στρουθία πωλοῦνται ἀσσαρίων δύο; καὶ ἓν ἐξ 6
αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλελησμένον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. ἀλλὰ καὶ 7
αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πᾶσαι ἠρίθμηνται· μὴ φοβεῖσθε·
πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἂν 8
ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

where ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις is not found and ἐν τῷ φωτί follows the verb. ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις is probably a Lucan addition to make an antithesis to ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων. ἀνθ' ὧν] Not in Mt. Also found Lk. i. 20, xix. 44; Ac. xii. 23. Besides this in N.T. only 2 Thess. ii. 10.

4. τοῖς φίλοις μου] Not in the par. in Mt. Here only in the synoptists are the disciples spoken of as 'the friends' of Jesus. But cf. Jo. xv. 14.

5. ὑποδείξω . . . φοβηθῆτε] Not in Mt. The same phrase (ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν) is found in Lk. vi. 47, where, as here, it is prob. editorial. The meaning is that they are to fear God.

ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν] The only mention of Gehenna in Lk. Mt. is more realistic: God has power to destroy body and soul in Gehenna. On Gehenna in Jewish theology cf. S.B., vol. iv., 2 Exkurs. 31, pp. 1022 f. Gehenna appears suddenly in the apocalyptic lit. of the 2nd cent. B.C. as the place of punishment of apostate Israelites after the last judgement. Already in pre-Christian times it has come to be regarded as the abode of the godless in the intermediate state, as well as after the judgement.

ναὶ λέγω κτλ.] Not in Mt.

6. God, against whom they are to fear to transgress, cares for the destiny of the humblest of his creatures, and the disciples are worth many such. He will therefore care for them.

πέντε στρουθία . . . ἀσσαρίων δύο] The difference from Mt. is curious: δύο στρουθία ἀσσαρίου x. 29.

οὐκ ἔστιν . . . τοῦ θεοῦ] Mt. is more pictorial and, doubtless, more original: οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. ἐνώπιον is dist. Lucan. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλελησμένον has a literary flavour.

7. An hyperbole. οὐχ ὅτι τὰς τρίχας ὁ θεὸς ἀριθμεῖ. Chrys. Cf. 1 Regn. xiv. 45; 2 Regn. xiv. 11; 3 Regn. i. 52; Lk. xxi. 18; Ac. xxvii. 34.

8-9. ὁμολογεῖν ἐν] An undoubted Semitism. Cf. Moulton, *Prol.* p. 104. The meaning is 'confess me.' ἐν ἐμοὶ . . . καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] Here, as in Mk. viii. 38 (= ix. 26 *supra*), the form of the saying is compatible with an interpretation which distinguishes between, or at least does not explicitly identify, Jesus and the Son of Man. He who confesses Jesus upon earth will be confessed by the Son of Man before God. In Mt. x. 32, on the

*ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ*
9 *θεοῦ· ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνη-*
10 *θήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ. Καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ*
*λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· τῷ δὲ*
11 *εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. Ὅταν*
*δὲ εἰσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ*
*τὰς ἐξουσίας, μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς [ἢ τί] ἀπολογήσησθε ἢ τί*
12 *εἴπητε· τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ*
13 *ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν.* *Εἶπεν δέ τις ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου αὐτῷ*
*Διδάσκαλε, εἰπὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου μερίσασθαι μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὴν*
14 *κληρονομίαν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἄνθρωπε, τίς με κατ-*

11 *πως* [*η τι*] om *η τι* D 157 lat.vt syr.cur aeth Clem Orig

other hand, the first personal pronoun is used in both clauses. This may be editorial, but it is not impossible that Mt. gives the earlier form, and that Son of Man here replaces a more primitive 'I.' The function ascribed to the heavenly Son of Man in this text is noteworthy: he is not here judge, as in Mk. viii. 38 and, more clearly, in Mt. xvi. 27, but rather the advocate of the faithful before God. *τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ*] i.e. at the last judgement. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 157, holds that *ἀγγέλων* is here used as a periphrasis for 'God,' and that *θεοῦ* is prob. not part of the original saying.

10. The interpretation of this verse is difficult. The verse preceding does not prepare us for the view that speech against the Son of Man is venial. Substantially the same saying occurs in Mt., but in a different context (xii. 32, the Beelzebub pericope). It may be presumed to come from Q. In Mt. the Q saying has been conflated with the similar saying from the Marcan version of the Beelzebub controversy (iii. 28, 29). In Mk. (reproduced in Mt. xii. 31) there is no mention of blasphemous speech against the Son of Man. It is said, "All things shall be forgiven *to the sons of men*," etc. Wellh. conjectures that Mk. and Mt. xii. 31 preserve the original form of the saying, and that 'the sons of men' has been transformed by misreading or misunderstanding into 'the Son of Man.' Luke perhaps intends blasphemy against the Holy Ghost to be interpreted by the following verses: the unforgivable sin is to be untrue to the testimony which the Holy Spirit will put into the mouth of the disciples.

11-12. A close parallel to Mk. xiii. 11 = Mt. x. 19 f. and Lk. xxi. 14 (where see note).

13. Wellh. refers to the common oriental custom of referring questions of disputed right in secular affairs to a religious authority.

14. Cf. Ex. ii. 14 *τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν; μεριστήν*] A rare word. See M.M. *s.v.* Here only in the Greek Bible. Jesus declines the rôle of arbitrator. His refusal is made the occasion of a warning against covetousness. But the connexion, which is not very close, is perhaps to be ascribed

ἔστησεν κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφʼ ὑμᾶς; εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς 15
Ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ πάσης πλεονεξίας, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν
τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων
αὐτῷ. Εἶπεν δὲ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων Ἀνθρώπου 16
τινός πλουσίου εὐφόρησεν ἡ χώρα. καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν αὐτῷ 17
λέγων Τί ποιήσω, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς
μου; καὶ εἶπεν Τοῦτο ποιήσω· καθελῶ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας 18
καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω, καὶ συνάξω ἐκεῖ πάντα τὸν σῖτον
καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου, καὶ ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ μου Ψυχή, ἔχεις 19
πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ [κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε],
εὐφραίνου. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ θεός Ἄφρων, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ 20
τὴν ψυχήν σου αἰτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ· ἃ δὲ ἡτοίμασας, τίνι
ἔσται; [Οὕτως ὁ θησαυρίζων αὐτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλου- 21
τῶν.] Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς [αὐτοῦ] Διὰ 22

19 *κειμενα . . . πιε* om D lat.vt 21 versum om D a b 22 *αυτου* om B c e

to the evangelist rather than to tradition.

15. 'Where man has abundance, yet is not his life constituted by his possessions.'

16-21. The folly of absorption in the goods of this life, in view of its brevity and uncertainty, shewn by a story. Parallels to the sentiment from classical writers are given in Wettstein. There may be reminiscence of Ecclus. xi. 18 f. (Heb.). Klostermann notes that this parable differs from most of the parallels in that here the story does not begin with the man's *efforts* to collect wealth. It starts with a picture of prosperity.

16. *εὐφόρησεν*] The word is found Jos. *B.J.* ii. 21. 2, but here only in the Greek Bible.

17-19. The man's self-communings are portrayed. *τί ποιήσω, ὅτι οὐκ . . . καὶ εἶπεν Τοῦτο ποιήσω*] Cf. xvi. 3 *τί ποιήσω ὅτι . . . ἔγνων τί ποιήσω* (the Unjust Steward), and xx. 13 where a similar ejaculation, ascribed to the Lord of the Vineyard, is introduced by Lk. into the Marcan version.

19. Wellh. and Blass prefer to follow the shorter text of D etc. The fuller reading is closely similar to Tobit vii. 10 *καὶ εἶπεν Ῥαγουὴλ πρὸς Τωβείαν Φάγε, πίε καὶ ἡδέως γίνου.* Cf. also the advice to man from the tomb of Sardanapalus *ἔσθιε, πῖνε, ὄχευε* (Wendland, *Hell. Röm. Kultur*$^3$, p. 290), and Eur. *Alc.* 788 *εὔφραινε σαυτόν, πῖνε, τὸν καθʼ ἡμέραν | βίον λογίζου σόν.*

20. *αἰτοῦσιν*] Semitic impersonal plural, equivalent to a passive.

21. The authenticity of the verse must be regarded as doubtful. It provides a transition to the discourse which follows. *μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν*] i.e. who fails to lay up an abiding treasure with God in heaven (*v.* 33).

22-32. The attitude of the disciples in face of human needs is to be conditioned by an overmastering confidence in God's providence. Anxiety for food and raiment cripples insight into the true nature of life and body which food and raiment are meant

*τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ*
23 *τῷ σώματι [ὑμῶν] τί ἐνδύσησθε. ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστιν*
24 *τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος. κατανοήσατε τοὺς*
*κόρακας ὅτι οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν, οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν*
*ταμεῖον οὐδὲ ἀποθήκη, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτούς· πόσῳ*
25 *μᾶλλον ὑμεῖς διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν. τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν*
*μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ προσθεῖναι πῆχυν;*
26 *εἰ οὖν οὐδὲ ἐλάχιστον δύνασθε, τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμ-*
27 *νᾶτε; κατανοήσατε τὰ κρίνα πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιᾷ οὐδὲ*
*νήθει· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ*
28 *περιεβάλετο ὡς ἓν τούτων. εἰ δὲ ἐν ἀγρῷ τὸν χόρτον ὄντα*
*σήμερον καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον ὁ θεὸς οὕτως*

22 *σωματι*] add *υμων* (= Matt vi 25) B al a aegg 26 *ει ουν . . . λοιπων*] *και περι των λοιπων τι* D lat.vt 27 *αυξανει ου κοπια ουδε νηθει* (= Matt vi 28)] *ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει* D a syr.vt Clem Tert

to serve. God feeds the birds and clothes the flowers. He will not do less for his human family. The freshness and originality of these words cannot be mistaken. For a just interpretation it is necessary to remember that Jesus and his disciples did not belong to 'the leisured classes,' and, in their application, that Jesus endorsed the popular judgement that the *labourer* is worthy of his hire (x. 7).

24. *οἷς οὐκ ἔστι κτλ.*] Mt. more graphically *οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας.*

25-26. Verse 26 has no parallel in Mt. *περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν* is weak and the verse may probably be regarded as an addition interpretative of *v.* 25. Verse 25 stands in the same place in the discourse in Mt. vi. 27 and therefore comes from Q. But it interrupts the balance of the verses, and it may be plausibly conjectured, with Bultmann, that community of idea (*μεριμνῶν*) with *vv.* 22 f. has at some stage in the literary history attracted the saying into a setting where it is not originally at home. *ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν προσθεῖναι πῆχυν*] *ἡλικία* must here mean 'age' not 'stature,' and *πῆχυς* must be used metaphorically of a span of time. A cubit would be a *large* addition to a man's height, but the context demands that the addition should be *small*. This is clearly assumed by Lk. in *v.* 26. The use of a measure of length for a period of time is a very natural metaphor and may be illustrated from Ps. xxxix. 5 (Heb.), "Behold, thou hast made my days handbreadths." For the use of *πῆχυς* to signify a short period of time cf. Mimnermus (Bergk, *Poet. Lyr. Gr.* ii. 26), *τοῖς (φύλλοις) ἴκελοι πήχυιον ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄνθεσιν ἥβης | τερπόμεθα.*

27. The reading of D etc. is prob. to be preferred to the reading in the text, which has perhaps been assimilated to Mt.

28. *εἰς κλίβανον*] i.e. for fuel. Phryn. clvi. *κλίβανος οὐκ ἐρεῖς, ἀλλὰ κρίβανος διὰ τοῦ ρ.* But *κλίβανος* occurs in Hdt. See Rutherford *ad loc.*

ἀμφιάζει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι. καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ 29
ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίητε, καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε, ταῦτα 30
γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν, ὑμῶν δὲ ὁ
πατὴρ οἶδεν ὅτι χρῄζετε τούτων· πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασι- 31
λείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. μὴ φοβοῦ, 32
τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον, ὅτι εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι
ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν. Πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν καὶ 33
δότε ἐλεημοσύνην· ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιού-
μενα, θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου κλέπτης
οὐκ ἐγγίζει οὐδὲ σὴς διαφθείρει· ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρὸς 34
ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν ἔσται. Ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ 35

29. *μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε*] Lk. only. Mt. continues *ἢ τί περιβαλώμεθα;* and this is prob. original. Trans. 'Be not anxious in mind.' This meaning is attested both for literary and colloquial Greek. See Preuschen-Bauer, *s.v.* The interpretation of the Vulg. 'in sublime tolli' is possible in itself (cf. 2 Macc. v. 17 and elsewhere) but does not give a good sense here.

31-32. *προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν*] After these words Mt. proceeds (vi. 34) to the saying 'Take no thought for the morrow,' etc., and with that closes the section. This last verse of Mt. is lacking in Lk. Lk. takes up the word *βασιλεία*, and passes on to the thought of the heavenly kingdom which the Father will bestow upon the little flock of the disciples. Therefore the disciples must wean their hearts from earthly possessions, and must be ready at all times lest they be taken unawares. From here onwards the thought of the Parousia is dominant, but it is doubtful whether it should be regarded as the controlling thought of the preceding verses (22 f.) either in their original form or in their Lucan setting. The imminence of death for the individual, not of the Parousia for the disciples, is the motive for unworldliness recognized in *vv.* 16-21, and Lk. intends this to form the transition to the sayings in *vv.* 22 f.

32 is peculiar to Lk.

33, 34 have parallels in Mt. vi. 19-21 where they precede the Matthaean equivalent of *vv.* 22-31 *supra*. Verse 34 is almost identical with Mt. vi. 21 (*ὑμῶν* for *σου*). Verse 33 is considerably different. For the negative exhortation in Mt., "Lay not up for yourselves treasure upon the earth," etc., we have the positive instruction: "Sell your possessions and give alms" (cf. xviii. 22). The ascetic colouring is thus heightened. The heavenly purses which do not wear out are peculiar to Luke, and are perhaps his own addition. *βαλλάντια*] Lucan only in N.T., cf. x. 4, xxii. 35, 36. The Matthaean version of the saying is rhythmical and observes the structure of parallelism. Here as elsewhere (cf. vi. 40, 46 f., xiii. 24) Luke breaks the Semitic parallelism.

35-38. The expectation of the Lord's return does not paralyse energy. The imperatives call up a fine picture of preparedness. The long eastern robe must be caught up

36 ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι καὶ οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι, καὶ ὑμεῖς
ὅμοιοι ἀνθρώποις προσδεχομένοις τὸν κύριον ἑαυτῶν πότε
ἀναλύσῃ ἐκ τῶν γάμων, ἵνα ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος εὐθέως
37 ἀνοίξωσιν αὐτῷ. μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἐλθὼν ὁ
κύριος εὑρήσει γρηγοροῦντας· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι περιζώσε-
ται καὶ ἀνακλινεῖ αὐτοὺς καὶ παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς.
38 κἂν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ κἂν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὕρῃ
39 οὕτως, μακάριοί εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι. τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ
ᾔδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγό-
ρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.
40 καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ᾗ ὥρᾳ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

38 καν εν τη δευτερα . . . ευρη ουτως] praem και εαν ελθη τη εσπερινη φυλακη και ευρη ουτως ποιουντας μακαριοι εισιν οτι ανακλινει αυτους και διακονησει αυτοις 1 etc ff$^2$ i l syr.cur Iren(lat): habent solum και εαν ελθη τη εσπερινη φυλακη και ευρησει ουτως ποιησει και εαν εν τη δευτερα και τη τριτη D c e, aliter etiam inter se diff codd et verss 39 εγρηγορησεν αν και ουκ] ουκ αν ℵD e i syr.vt arm sah$^{codd}$ Tert 40 versum om 1 etc

round the waist if it is not to hinder action. Cf. the metaphorical application of the action in 1 Pet. i. 13. This section is peculiar to Luke, but it very likely corresponds to a passage of Q. The 'lights burning' in *v.* 35 recall the parable of the Ten Virgins in Mt. xxv. which follows the sayings given here *vv.* 39 f. The parable of the Ten Virgins is probably not one of the more primitive elements of the Gospel (see Wellhausen's subtle analysis, *Ev. Matt.* pp. 128 f.), but it may utilise a *motif* which stood in Q. A closer parallel to this section is Mk. xiii. 32 f., and as Luke substituted another conclusion (xxi. fin.) to the eschatological discourse from Mk. xiii., he very likely himself regarded Mk. xiii. 33 f. and this passage as variants.

36. ἐκ τῶν γάμων] The marriage feast is not here significant. γάμοι may be used simply for a feast. So in Esther ii. 18, ix. 22, and perhaps here. It represents the joys of heaven which the returning Messiah leaves behind. But the picture centres upon the feast which the returned Lord will make for his servants.

καὶ κρούσαντος] Here, as in Rev. iii. 20, it is Christ who knocks. In xiii. 25 and in the parable of the Ten Virgins, it is others who knock that Christ may open; cf. also xi. 10 *supra*.

37. The Lord himself will serve his servants, cf. Mk. x. 45 and *infra* xxii. 27. We have perhaps here the source of the great scene of the feet-washing at the Last Supper in Jo. xiii.

38. The three watches correspond to Jewish usage, as against the Roman division of the night into four watches, cf. Mk. xiii. fin. The second and third watches are mentioned to enhance the zeal of the faithful watchers, who, if need be, will remain at their post till the night is past.

39-46. These verses occur in the same order in Mt. xxiv. 43-51. After the first saying Luke has interpolated a question from Peter which has the

ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται. Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος Κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς 41
τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας; καὶ εἶπεν 42
ὁ κύριος Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος, ὁ φρόνιμος, ὃν
καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ διδόναι
ἐν καιρῷ [τὸ] σιτομέτριον; μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν 43
ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει ποιοῦντα οὕτως· ἀληθῶς 44
λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ κατα-
στήσει αὐτόν. ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ 45
αὐτοῦ Χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι, καὶ ἄρξηται τύ-
πτειν τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τὰς παιδίσκας, ἐσθίειν τε καὶ πίνειν
καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι, ἥξει ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου ἐν 46
ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ οὐ προσδοκᾷ καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ᾗ οὐ γινώσκει, καὶ διχο-
τομήσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων
θήσει. ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου 47

42 om το BD 69

effect of directing the sayings which follow to Peter and the other apostles, the future rulers of the Church. The application is made clearer in Lk. by the reading οἰκονόμος 'steward' in *v.* 42 in place of δοῦλος (Mt.).

41. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος] A tendency, itself due to genuine historical impression, can be recognised in the Gospel writers to make Peter spokesman for the apostles; cf. Mt. xv. 15 with Mk. vii. 17.

τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην] The reference is probably not to be confined to the two verses immediately preceding, but should include the promises of *v.* 37. Is this blessedness reserved for the apostles, or is it for all faithful disciples? In answer Jesus gives the warnings and promises especially appropriate to the apostles.

42. θεραπείας] In the sense of 'household,' 'body of servants,' here only in N.T. (Mt. οἰκετείας). Class. Cf. Gen. xlv. 16 ἐχάρη δὲ Φαραὼ καὶ ἡ θεραπεία αὐτοῦ.

σιτομέτριον] Prob. Lk.'s substitute for τροφήν (Mt.). The noun is not known from other literary documents, but is quoted from papyri. See M.M. For the vb. σιτομετρεῖν cf. Gen. xlvii. 12, 14.

45. τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τὰς παιδίσκας] Mt. τοὺς συνδούλους. Lk. alters this to conform with his substitution of οἰκονόμος for δοῦλος above (*v.* 42). The οἰκονόμος is himself a δοῦλος (*v.* 45), but Lk. is anxious to bring out his superiority in office to the other servants.

παιδίσκας] Cf. Phryn. ccxvi. παιδίσκη· τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπαίνης οἱ νῦν τιθέασιν, οἱ δ' ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς νεάνιδος.

46. διχοτομήσει] To be taken literally; cf. 1 Par. xx. 3; Amos i. 3; Hom. *Od.* xviii. 339; Suet. *Calig.* 27.

μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων] Mt. μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν. Lk. is prob. secondary. ὑποκριτής thrice only in Lk.

47-48. Peculiar to Luke. The situation of the servants in these verses is other than that of the steward of the preceding verses who has been set by his master over the

αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐ-
48 τοῦ δαρήσεται πολλάς· ὁ δὲ μὴ γνοὺς ποιήσας δὲ ἄξια
πληγῶν δαρήσεται ὀλίγας. παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ
ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ᾧ παρέθεντο πολύ, περισσό-
49 τερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν. Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν,
50 καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη. βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆ-

household. The present connexion is no doubt secondary. Perhaps Luke intends to carry on the thought of the responsibility of the leaders of the Church. The leaders, who know, will, if unfaithful, be more severely punished than others who have not had their opportunities. The principle is that enunciated by Amos iii. 2. Wellh. suggests that the contrast originally in mind was, as in Amos, between Jews and heathen. Jülicher prefers to suppose the original reference was to scribes and unlettered Jews.

Klostermann takes 48a as in the nature of a parenthesis and regards 48b as a general statement affirming the principle of 47. The two clauses of 48b then mean practically the same thing. περισσότερον answers grammatically to πολύ, but the force of the comparative is not to be pressed. But this seems to obscure the force of the whole for which the contrast between ὁ γνούς and ὁ μὴ γνούς is essential. If this contrast governs 48b, then περισσότερον will mean 'more than from those to whom less had been given.' Then the two clauses of 48b answer to 47 and 48a respectively, except that the second clause of 48b somewhat awkwardly states the principle of the 'few stripes' by saying positively that of the better endowed more is required.

49-53. The thought of the judgement perhaps suggests the idea of the trials through which Jesus and his disciples must first pass. Verses 51-53 have a parallel in Mt. x. 34-36 (the charge to the Twelve). Verses 49-50 are peculiar to Luke.

49. πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν] The fire must be a symbol for the division of which the subsequent verses speak. βαλεῖν is not appropriate to spiritualising interpretations of the 'fire,' e.g. the fire of holiness (suggested by Plummer), or the fire of faith (Zahn). Nor would Jesus speak of himself as casting the fire of the judgement (Klostermann). βαλεῖν is used as the verb with μάχαιραν in the parallel to *v.* 51 in Mt. x. 34. Perhaps here as there it comes from Q (Loisy).

τί θέλω εἰ . . .] It is best not to punctuate (as W.H.) with a question mark. Translate 'How earnestly I wish that . . .' The verse then falls into place and makes a good parallel to *v.* 50. For τί with the force of an exclamation (representing Heb. מָה) cf. 2 Regn. vi. 20 τί δεδόξασται σήμερον ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ, and see Preuschen-Bauer *s.v.* τίς. For εἰ after θέλω with the force of 'that' cf. Is. ix. 5, Ecclus. xxiii. 14. Christ wishes that the fire were already kindled, because it must needs be so before the kingdom of God can come.

50. βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι] i.e. the baptism of death as in Mk. x. 38 (not reproduced in Lk.). The metaphor of troubles overwhelming the soul as with a flood is found in the Psalter, cf. Pss. xlii. 7, lxix. 2. καὶ πῶς συνέχομαι] The whole of the Lord's life until the

*ναι, καὶ πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελεσθῇ. δοκεῖτε ὅτι* 51
*εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν,*
*ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν. ἔσονται γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν* 52
*ἑνὶ οἴκῳ διαμεμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσὶν καὶ δύο ἐπὶ*
*τρισίν, διαμερισθήσονται πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ* υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί, 53
*μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατέρα καὶ* θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα, *πενθερὰ*
*ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς καὶ* νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν.

*Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις Ὅταν ἴδητε νεφέλην ἀνατέλ-* 54
*λουσαν ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε ὅτι Ὄμβρος ἔρχεται,*
*καὶ γίνεται οὕτως· καὶ ὅταν νότον πνέοντα, λέγετε ὅτι* 55
*Καύσων ἔσται, καὶ γίνεται. ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς* 56
*γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν καιρὸν δὲ*
*τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν; Τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν* 57
*οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον; ὡς γὰρ ὑπάγεις μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου* 58

end comes is spent in trials, cf. xxii. 28.

51. *δοῦναι*] Mt. *βαλεῖν* as Lk. above in *v.* 49. *δοῦναι* is more appropriate to the abstract *διαμερισμόν* which represents *μάχαιραν* (Mt.).

52. *πέντε ἐν ἑνὶ οἴκῳ*] Of the six members of the household mentioned in the next verse *πενθερά* and *μήτηρ* are the same person. This verse is not represented in Mt. and is probably an amplification. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* is Lucan.

53. Micah vii. 6. In Micah and Matthew it is the younger generation which rises against the older. But in Lk. the hostility is represented as mutual.

54-56. The thought of the judgement is still predominant. Jesus now addresses the multitudes. They can discern the face of nature: they ought also to be able to discern the age. The saying is similar in content though different in form from the saying interpolated at Mt. xvi. 2-3. In the latter the natural tokens are different: a red sky at night and a red sky in the morning.

57. This reads as if it were an editorial insertion to make connexion.

*ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν*] Connects both with what precedes and with what follows: they should be able to see of themselves what the time calls for. If they do not, of themselves, act in time as the time requires, they will fall under the condemnation of the judge.

*κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον*] 'give a just judgement.' For the phrase cf. an inscr. from Amorgos, *B.C.H.* 25 (1901), p. 416; Deissmann, *Light from the East*$^4$, p. 117.

58-59. Parabolic. A wise man in ordinary life settles accounts with his enemy before he becomes liable to the jurisdiction of the judge. The same wisdom is called for in face of the approaching judgement of God. The same saying appears also in Mt. v. 25-26, where, however, it is used quite otherwise: instead of a parable, the saying becomes in Mt. a direct precept: viz. be reconciled with your adversary, for he, it is implied by the context, is your brother,

σου ἐπ’ ἄρχοντα, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι [ἀπ’]
αὐτοῦ, μή ποτε κατασύρῃ σε πρὸς τὸν κριτήν, καὶ ὁ κριτής
σε παραδώσει τῷ πράκτορι, καὶ ὁ πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς
59 φυλακήν. λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως καὶ τὸ
ἔσχατον λεπτὸν ἀποδῷς.

XIII. 1 Παρῆσαν δέ τινες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ ἀπαγγέλλοντες αὐτῷ
περὶ τῶν Γαλιλαίων ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πειλᾶτος ἔμιξεν μετὰ τῶν
2 θυσιῶν αὐτῶν. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Δοκεῖτε ὅτι οἱ
Γαλιλαῖοι οὗτοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους
3 ἐγένοντο, ὅτι ταῦτα πεπόνθασιν; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐὰν
4 μὴ μετανοῆτε πάντες ὁμοίως ἀπολεῖσθε. ἢ ἐκεῖνοι οἱ δέκα
ὀκτὼ ἐφ’ οὓς ἔπεσεν ὁ πύργος ἐν τῷ Σιλωὰμ καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν

58 om απ B

against whom you must harbour no hostile thought.

58. δὸς ἐργασίαν] Not in Mt. Equiv. to Lat. *da operam*. But the term had passed into the Greek vernacular. Cf. Dittenberger, *O.G.I.S.* 441. 109, and Deissmann, *Light*$^4$, p. 116.

κατασύρῃ] A more appropriate term to use of the adversary than παραδιδόναι, which in Mt. is used both of the adversary and of the judge.

πράκτωρ] A common Greek term for an official, particularly in connexion with finance. Here only in N.T. Mt. has ὑπηρέτης.

59. λεπτόν] Lk. avoids the vulgar κοδράντης (Mt.).

1 f. The thought of the judgement is still dominant. ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ connects this paragraph closely with the preceding. Disasters which have befallen individuals do not prove them to have been sinners above all men. A like fate awaits them all, both Galileans and inhabitants of Judaea, unless they repent.

1. Nothing is known of the incident here reported. Josephus records (*Ant.* xviii. 3. 2, *B.J.* ii. 9. 4) a murderous attack by Pilate's soldiers upon a riotous assembly of Jews, but this does not answer to the slaughtering of Galileans in the Temple Courts at Jerusalem which is here implied. Wellh. follows Beza in suspecting a reference to the attack upon *Samaritans* on Mt. Gerizim which led to Pilate's recall (*Ant.* xviii. 4. 1). This event did not take place until after the crucifixion of Jesus.

παρῆσαν δέ τινες . . . ἀπαγγέλλοντες] 'Some men came and brought tidings.' For πάρειμι in the sense of 'to arrive' (class.) cf. Acts x. 21, and for the whole phrase cf. Diod. Sic. xvii. 8. 2 παρῆσάν τινες ἀπαγγέλλοντες πολλοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων νεωτερίζειν.

2. πάντας] In the sense of 'all *other* Galileans.' Cf. iii. 20, xiv. 10.

4. It is not remarkable that nothing should be known of this incident, which would have no political significance. Zahn conjectures that the accident was connected with Pilate's improvement of the water supply, which, as it was financed out of sacred monies, led to the disturbance mentioned by Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3. 2, *B.J.* ii. 9. 4. The fall

αὐτούς, δοκεῖτε ὅτι αὐτοὶ ὀφειλέται ἐγένοντο παρὰ πάντας
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ἰερουσαλήμ; οὐχί, 5
λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσητε πάντες ὡσαύτως
ἀπολεῖσθε. Ἔλεγεν δὲ ταύτην τὴν παραβολήν. 6
Συκῆν εἶχέν τις πεφυτευμένην ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ, καὶ
ἦλθεν ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ οὐχ εὗρεν. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς 7
τὸν ἀμπελουργόν Ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι ζητῶν
καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκω· ἔκκοψον αὐτήν·
ἵνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ 8
Κύριε, ἄφες αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος, ἕως ὅτου σκάψω περὶ
αὐτὴν καὶ βάλω κόπρια· κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰς τὸ 9
μέλλον—εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν.

8 κοπρια] κοφινον κοπριων D lat.vt Orig(lat)

of the tower in Siloam is an anticipation of the greater destruction which threatens the whole city.

5. πάντες ἀπολεῖσθε] Here, as in *v.* 3, it is not destruction in the world to come that is in mind, but the destruction of the nation.

6-9. A parable peculiar to Luke. It seems probable that Luke regarded it as a substitute for the strange story of the blasting of the fig-tree, to which Jesus came 'seeking fruit' and 'found none' (Mk. xi. 12 f.), as he has omitted the latter at its proper place. The position of the parable after the preceding narrative points to an interpretation of the fig-tree as symbolical of the Jewish people, which is to be allowed yet a short period for repentance. Wellh., however, holds that the Jewish people must (as in Is. v.) be symbolised by the *vineyard* and interprets the fig-tree of the individual. Zahn interprets the fig-tree of Jerusalem which stands in the midst of Israel (the vineyard). For the idea of the parable cf. iii. 9 *supra*, and *Story of Ahikar*, 8. 35 (Syr.), Charles, *Pseudepigr.* ii. p. 775.

7. ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη] Nom. Cf. *v.* 16 *infra* and Mk. viii. 2. The constr. is Aramaic. Wellh. notes that Aramaic has no word for 'already.'

9. The apodosis is suppressed by an idiom, common in Semitic and well recognised in Greek. Cf. Blass, § 78. 2.

## JESUS IN THE SYNAGOGUE. A MIRACLE ON THE SABBATH DAY (xiii. 10-21)

A miraculous healing which, like xiv. 1 *infra* and vi. 6 f. (= Mk. iii. 1 f.), serves to illustrate the attitude of Jesus towards the Sabbath law. Here, as below (xiv. 1 f.), the argument is that if it is right to care for cattle on the Sabbath day, *a fortiori* it is right to relieve human distress. This principle is not asserted in Mark, but at Mt. xii. 11 a saying closely similar to Lk. xiv. 5 has been interpolated into the Matthaean version of the Marcan miracle.

This narrative may be grouped with the series of narratives—the widow of Nain (*c.* vii.), the healing of the dropsical man (*c.* xiv.), the ten lepers (*c.* xvii.), Zacchaeus (*c.* xix.)—which are peculiar to Luke, but which may be regarded as in some respects counterparts to narratives in Mark. Cf. Introd. p. lxviii. Certain features may be noted as common to two or more of these narratives—conspicuously the usage of ὁ *κύριος* of Jesus in narrative. This usage never occurs in the strictly Marcan passages in Luke, and may therefore with some probability be supposed to go back to Luke's source, unless we suppose the evangelist himself to be responsible for the actual composition of these stories. For another point of contact between this narrative and the narrative of Zacchaeus see *v.* 16 n. The somewhat conventional combination of ideas and words in *v.* 13 *καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀνωρθώθη, καὶ ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεόν*, the play with the word *λύω* in *vv.* 15, 16, and the Biblical reminiscence in *v.* 17 (see note), help to give the impression that we have here to do with a more sophisticated type of writing than we find in Mark.

It is hard to discover any community in idea with the preceding section. Loisy suggests that "the Fathers who saw the Church symbolized by the woman who was healed, as opposed to the unfruitful and proscribed fig-tree of the synagogue, have perhaps unintentionally hit upon the idea which has determined the arrangement of these fragments. The narrative of the Sabbath-day healing may then be a fictitious doublet of the Galilean narrative common to the three synoptists, as the young man of Nain is a doublet of Jairus's daughter, and it will have been placed in the direction of Samaria with the express purpose of symbolizing the salvation of the Gentiles" (p. 364). This must be pronounced quite unconvincing. Not one phrase or one word suggests the symbolism which Loisy wishes to find. Yet in a general sense it may be true that Luke feels the story of a successful healing carried out in the face of Jewish opposition congenial to his recent theme of the judgement imminent upon the Jewish people.

This is the only instance in which Jesus is represented as preaching in a synagogue during the latter part of his ministry. Wellhausen notes that it would be more natural to find such an incident recorded in connexion with Capernaum, rather than on a journey from Galilee to Jerusalem.

Luke has appended the two parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven, which he probably intends us to picture as delivered in the synagogue on the same occasion. How exactly the parables were intended originally it is hard to say, but the fundamental idea is unmistakable: how great results may come from how small beginnings! Here, at any rate, Luke and his readers would probably think of the Gentile Church.

Ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν. 10
καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας ἔτη δέκα 11
ὀκτώ, καὶ ἦν συνκύπτουσα καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς
τὸ παντελές. ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἰησοῦς προσεφώνησεν καὶ 12
εἶπεν αὐτῇ Γύναι, ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σου, καὶ 13
ἐπέθηκεν αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας· καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀνωρθώθη, καὶ
ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεόν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ἀγανακτῶν 14
ὅτι τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγεν τῷ
ὄχλῳ ὅτι Ἓξ ἡμέραι εἰσὶν ἐν αἷς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι· ἐν αὐταῖς
οὖν ἐρχόμενοι θεραπεύεσθε καὶ μὴ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου.
ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος καὶ εἶπεν Ὑποκριταί, 15
ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν
ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπάγων ποτίζει; ταύτην δὲ 16
θυγατέρα Ἀβραὰμ οὖσαν, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα
καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη, οὐκ ἔδει λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου τῇ
ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου; Καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντος αὐτοῦ κατῃσχύνοντο 17
πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος
ἔχαιρεν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

Ἔλεγεν οὖν Τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία 18

11. *πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας*] i.e. a spirit which caused weakness. The symptoms of the possession are transferred to the spirit.

*μὴ δυναμένη . . . παντελές*] 'unable to lift herself up straight.' *εἰς τὸ παντελές* goes with the infin. *ἀνακύψαι*, not with *μὴ δυναμένη* as in *vg.*: "nec omnino poterat." For *εἰς τὸ παντελές* cf. Heb. vii. 25. Not elsewhere in N.T.

13. *ἀνωρθώθη*] Good Greek. LXX. In N.T. here only (except quotations in Ac. xv. 16 and Heb. xii. 12).

15-16. Montefiore complains of the logic of this answer. The cattle must certainly be watered daily, but their case is not analogous to that of a woman who has been infirm for eighteen years, and therefore, for all that the comparison proves, might be expected to wait another day. The analogy between 'loosing' cattle from the stall (*λύει*) and 'loosing' the woman from her infirmity (*λυθῆναι*) strikes the reader as a trifle forced and artificial.

16. *θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ*] The phrase not elsewhere in N.T., but cf. xix. 9 (of Zacchaeus) *καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ*.

*ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη*] For the grammar cf. *v.* 7 *supra*.

17. *κατῃσχύνοντο κτλ.*] Cf. Is. xlv. 16 *αἰσχυνθήσονται καὶ ἐντραπήσονται πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ*.

18. Note the parallelism of the introduction. A similar form is found in the introduction to the parable of the mustard seed in Mk. iv. 30.

19 *τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν; ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ*
*σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ,*
*καὶ ηὔξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, καὶ* τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ
20 οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ. *Καὶ πάλιν*
21 *εἶπεν Τίνι ὁμοιώσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; ὁμοία ἐστὶν*
*ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἔκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία*
*ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.*

19. Luke is here dependent upon Q who must have given the parables of the mustard seed and of the leaven as a pair. Cf. Mt. xiii. 31-33. The mustard seed but not the leaven is given in Mk. iv. The mustard seed has been omitted by Lk. from the Marcan source at viii. 18. The literary relations of the versions of Mk., Lk. and Mt. are carefully examined by Streeter, pp. 246 f. He concludes that Luke faithfully reproduces Q and that 'almost every word' in Mt. comes either from Mk. or Q.

21. This is almost exactly equivalent to Mt. xiii. 33. In this parable leaven represents the operation of God's kingdom or of the preaching of the kingdom. Elsewhere it is always symbolic of evil influences.

## THE ELECT (xiii. 22-35)

A further collection of sayings to which parallels may be found in different parts of Matthew. The rejection of the Jews, the admission of the Gentiles, and the fate of Jerusalem are again the determining ideas.

The present arrangement may be plausibly ascribed to the evangelist. The connexion between *v.* 24 and *v.* 25 depends upon the parabolic use of 'the door,' which, however, is differently applied in the two sayings. At *v.* 28 Luke appears to have recast the saying in order to relate what follows to what precedes. The reply of Jesus when he is informed of Herod's designs is peculiar to Luke (*vv.* 31-33). See introd. to ix. 7-9 *supra*. It leads on to a lament over Jerusalem, which in Mt. xxiii. appears as a continuation of the denunciation which Luke has reproduced in xi. 49-51. It may be conjectured that Luke found it unsuitable for the setting at the feast in the Pharisee's house which he has provided for the precedent 'woes' on the Pharisees, and has therefore attached it to the saying that "it cannot be that a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem." The present setting raises a grave difficulty of interpretation which the Matthaean setting avoids, cf. *vv.* 34, 35 n.

22 *Καὶ διεπορεύετο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας διδάσκων καὶ*
23 *πορείαν ποιούμενος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Εἶπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ*

22. We are again reminded—somewhat abruptly—that Jesus is on the road to Jerusalem.

23-24. A similar saying is given by Mt. vii. 13-14—but with a difference. Lk. thinks of a narrow door (*θύρα*)

Κύριε, εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς
Ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας, ὅτι πολλοί, 24
λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν. ἀφ᾽ 25
οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν,
καὶ ἄρξησθε ἔξω ἑστάναι καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν λέγοντες
Κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ὑμῖν Οὐκ οἶδα
ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ· τότε ἄρξεσθε λέγειν Ἐφάγομεν 26
ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδί-
δαξας· καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν Οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπό- 27
στητε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας. Ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ 28
κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, ὅταν ὄψησθε

into a house, through which it is hard to enter; Mt., on the other hand, contrasts a broad road and a wide city gate (πύλη) with a narrow road and a narrow gate. Streeter thinks that Mt. has here as elsewhere conflated Q and another source, and that the 'gate' in Mt. comes from Q and the 'road' from Mt.'s special source (M). It is somewhat against this theory that the 'gate' is not attested by Lk., and that the 'gate' and the 'road' harmonise well in one picture. Perhaps therefore Mt. here gives us a more original form of the saying, which Lk. has modified in order to bring the θύρα into connexion with the saying in *v.* 25. The question in *v.* 23 may be editorial in order to provide a setting for the subsequent sayings. It would naturally be suggested by the words which are given as the answer, especially if Lk. had read a longer form as in Mt.; cf. esp. Mt. vii. 14 καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εὑρίσκοντες αὐτήν.

24. ἀγωνίζεσθε] Used by Paul. Here only in the synoptic Gospels.

25. W.H. punctuated with a comma after ἰσχύσουσιν, thus making this verse dependent upon the preceding. It seems better, however, to put a full stop between 24 and 25. The θύρα is the connecting link between the two verses, but the sayings seem to be originally independent: in the former saying the emphasis falls upon the *narrowness* of the door: here the point is that after a certain time the door will be *closed*. But the grammar of *v.* 25 is far from clear. The apodosis perhaps begins with καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ, 'then shall he answer and say to you'; or we might put a comma at ἔστε and make the apodosis start at τότε ἄρξεσθε. The picture of the belated visitors shut out of the house reappears in the Matthaean parable of the ten virgins. Wellh. thinks that Mt. has elaborated a simpler form of parable such as that here attested by Lk.

26-27. Cf. Mt. vii. 22, 23, where, however, the excluded applicants claim that they have prophesied and worked miracles in the name of Christ. In both Mt. and Lk. the words of rejection are taken from Ps. vi. 9. The former part of the sentence agrees more closely with the LXX in Luke, and the latter part of the sentence in Mt.

28 f. The Lucan form of the plea for admission (esp. ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας) makes it clear that

*Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας*
*ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω.*
29 *καὶ ἥξουσιν* ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν *καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ*
30 *νότου καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ*
*ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι, καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι*
31 *οἳ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι.* *Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθάν*
*τινες Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες αὐτῷ Ἔξελθε καὶ πορεύου*
32 *ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι Ἡρῴδης θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι. καὶ εἶπεν*
*αὐτοῖς Πορευθέντες εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ Ἰδοὺ*
*ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον,*

the rejected guests are Jews. In *vv.* 28-30 we have the complementary picture of the reception of the Gentiles, whom the excluded Jews, in pain and humiliation, will see taking their places with patriarchs and prophets at the Messianic feast in the kingdom of God. The saying *vv.* 28, 29 is incorporated by Mt. in his version of the healing of the Centurion's servant (viii. 11-12). The Matthaean version uses the phrases ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων more naturally of 'the outer darkness' into which 'the sons of the kingdom' are banished. The phrase —which occurs here only in Lk.— is somewhat awkward at the beginning of the sentence, and the ἐκεῖ shews that the wording has been disarranged. The evangelist appears to have transposed the sentence in order to heighten the picture of Jewish dismay at the sight of the admission of the Gentiles: ὅταν ὄψησθε κτλ.

30. i.e. the Gentiles, who were last, shall take precedence of the once favoured Jews. The same saying is differently applied in Mk. x. 31 (= Mt. xix. 30) and Mt. xx. 16.

31. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ] An indication that the narrative which follows is intended by Luke to be taken in connexion with what precedes. The lament over Jerusalem with which it concludes (*v.* 34 f.) expresses the sorrow of Jesus over the apostasy of the nation. The incident is peculiar to Luke. It appears to be out of place when Jesus is already on the way to Jerusalem and has left Herod's territory in Galilee—unless we suppose, what is in no way indicated, that Jesus was in the Peraean territory of Antipas. Probably the incident should be located in Galilee and at an earlier date in the ministry. For Herod's interest in the proceedings of Jesus cf. Mk. vi. 14 (= ix. 7 f. *supra*). It has been plausibly conjectured that Mark's source at this point recorded some hostile activity on Herod's part, which has disappeared from the present Gospel.

32. τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ] Elsewhere in the Bible the fox is a destructive rather than a cunning animal. This may be the force of the word here. So Wellh. But the Greeks, like ourselves, regarded the fox as a type of cunning (see P.B. *s.v.*), and this idea is also attested for Rabbinic literature. Cf. Midrash on Cant. ii. 15, quoted in S.B. ii. p. 200. But acc. to S.B. the fox in Rabbinic is more frequently used to signify a worthless insignificant man. This last would give an appropriate meaning for this passage.

*καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι. πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον* 33
*καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην*
*ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἰερουσαλήμ. Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλήμ,* 34
*ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς*
*ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν,—ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι*
*τὰ τέκνα σου ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν ὑπὸ τὰς*
*πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε. ἰδοὺ* ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκοϲ 35

32-33. *ἰδοὺ ἐκβάλλω . . . πορεύεσθαι*] This is very obscure. The answer to Herod is certainly in general that Jesus intends to continue his work in spite of the threat. But if he works cures 'to-day and to-morrow,' how is it that he also 'goes on his way'—this is what the Pharisees had advised—'to-day and to-morrow'? Wellh. suspects a primitive corruption. He proposes to delete as glosses *καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι* and the second *σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καί* (*v.* 33). He suggests that the first addition was *καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι* 'on the third day I am made perfect' (i.e. by the crucifixion and resurrection, cf. Heb. ii. 10, v. 9). This gloss left *τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι* in an impossible position, and the second *σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καί* was inserted to provide the required preliminary for *τῇ ἐχομένῃ*. With these omissions a clear sense is given: "I shall continue my work for the present; nevertheless I shall shortly go on my way—not because Herod threatens, but because a prophet must not perish outside Jerusalem."

34-35. The apostrophe to Jerusalem occurs in Mt. xxiii. 37 f. as a sequel to the words which Luke has given above (xi. 49-51). The connexion in Mt. is good, and the situation in Jerusalem leaves open a good interpretation of the difficult last verse (with the words *ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι* added after *ἴδητε*): Jesus, speaking on the eve of his Passion, affirms that he will next be seen as the returning Messiah. It is noteworthy that the last verse appears to assume, as J. Weiss notes, that the Jews will acknowledge the true Messiah when he returns, cf. Ac. iii. 19 f., Ro. xi. 26. But if the lament is spoken, as Luke represents it, while Jesus is on the way to Jerusalem, how can Jesus say, "ye shall not see me until ye shall say Blessed is he . . ."—unless, indeed, Luke thought that the salutation referred to the triumphal entry, xix. 38? But that gives a very bald sense, and leaves the last words and the preceding lament without any intelligible connexion.

34. *ἠθέλησα*] The subject in Lk. is, of course, Jesus, but if the connexion in Mt. xxiii. reproduces Q, and if Lk. reproduces Q in ascribing xi. 49-51 to 'the Wisdom of God,' then the original subject of *ἠθέλησα* will have been not Jesus, but God, or the Wisdom of God. Harnack holds that Jesus quotes a lament which in the original was uttered by God.

35. *ἀφίεται . . . ὑμῶν*] Cf. Jer. xxii. 5, xii. 7. Lk. does not give *ἔρημος*, which, however, is not certainly original in Mt. It may have been inserted under the influence of Jer. xxii. 5. The meaning is in any case not different. W.H. following ℵB have omitted *ἥξει ὅτε* after *ἕως*, but the combination D latt and syrr

ὙΜῶΝ. λέγω [δὲ] ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως εἴπητε
ΕΥ̓ΛΟΓΗΜΈΝΟΣ Ὁ ἘΡΧΌΜΕΝΟΣ ἘΝ ὈΝΌΜΑΤΙ ΚΥΡΊΟΥ.

35 εως] add ηξει οτε AD al plur latt syrr : om ℵBL 1 etc. e aegg. cf. Mt xxiii. 39

is strong in its favour, and it seems an unlikely insertion. ὅτε εἴπητε κτλ. must be taken as subject to ἥξει. Wellh. suggests that ὅτε may represent the Aram. relative: 'he to whom.'

### AT THE TABLE OF A PHARISEE (xiv. 1-24)

Jesus dines with a Pharisee on a Sabbath day. He heals a dropsical man who is then present, and justifies his healing on the Sabbath to the lawyers (*vv.* 1-6). He addresses the guests, bidding them, when invited to a feast, to take the lowest place (7-11). Next the host is addressed and bidden to invite the poor and the afflicted rather than the wealthy who can return the hospitality (12-14). Then, in reply to an exclamation from one of the guests, "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God," Jesus propounds a parable which shews that this blessedness is little valued by those who were first bidden and that their places will be taken by others.

It is very plain that the scene is a literary device to provide a setting for the sayings, all of which have in common the theme of a feast. The motive for including the healing of the dropsical man in the same setting is less obvious. The address to the guests is couched in general terms (ὅταν κληθῇς ὑπό τινος), and this does not harmonise with the idea that the speech is addressed to guests who are then and there choosing their places. The address to the host is equally inappropriate, if spoken to an actual host whose hospitality has been accepted.

The healing of the dropsical man appears to be another variant of the theme of healing on the Sabbath. Cf. xiii. 10 f. and vi. 6 f. (= Mk. iii. 1). The miracle is peculiar to Luke, but the saying in *v.* 5 was known to Matthew and interpolated by him into his version of the Marcan miracle (xii. 11). The next two sections (7-11, 12-14) are peculiar to Luke. The concluding parable has a parallel in Mt. xxii. 1 f. The differences between the two versions of the parable, which are considerable, seem to favour the hypothesis that Matthew gives the parable in a more developed and more allegorical form than that which appears here.

XIV. 1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκόν τινος τῶν

1. καὶ ἐγένετο κτλ.] Cf. i. 8 n. τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν Φαρισαίων] 'one of the rulers, who was of the Pharisees.' τῶν Φαρισαίων is best taken as equivalent to ἐκ τῶν Φ. rather than as governed by ἀρχόντων.

ἀρχόντων [τῶν] Φαρισαίων σαββάτῳ φαγεῖν ἄρτον καὶ
αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπός τις 2
ἦν ὑδρωπικὸς ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς 3
εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους λέγων Ἔξεστιν
τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι ἢ οὔ; οἱ δὲ ἡσύχασαν. καὶ 4
ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν. καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς 5
εἶπεν Τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ
οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου; καὶ 6
οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἀνταποκριθῆναι πρὸς ταῦτα. Ἔλεγεν 7
δὲ πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους παραβολήν, ἐπέχων πῶς τὰς

1 *αρχοντων των*] om *των* BK* 5 *υιος η βους* AB al pler e f q syr(vg.hl) sah Cyr: *υιος η βους η ονος* syr.cur: *βους η ονος* syr.sin aeth: *ονος η βους* ℵL 1 etc, 124 etc, 33 al pauc a b vg boh arm pal ϛ: *προβατον η βους* D

Cf. Jo. iii. 1. The omission of τῶν in B is doubtless a slip due to homoioteleuton with ἀρχόντων.

φαγεῖν ἄρτον] The Sabbath day was no hindrance to Jewish hospitality. The dishes were prepared on Friday and kept warm until they were wanted. Cf. Mishn. *Sabbath*, ed. Beer, iv. 1, and Aug. *Enarr. in Ps.* xci. 2.

2. ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν ὑδρωπικός] The presence of the man is not explained. The Pharisees were on the look-out for an opening to attack Jesus, but it is not necessary to suppose that the man was present by the deliberate intention of the host. Apparently he was not one of the guests (ἀπέλυσεν *v.* 4). The incident appears to be thought of as taking place before the company have taken their places at the feast (*v.* 7).

3. ἀποκριθείς] Jesus replies to the unspoken suspicions of the watching Pharisees as in vi. 8 *supra*. Or ἀποκριθείς may not be more significant than in xiii. 4.

ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ κτλ.] The question of Jesus is substantially the same as above, vi. 9 (reproducing the Marcan counterpart).

5. For the argument *a fortiori* from a beast to a man cf. Mt. xii. 11, and *supra* xiii. 15.

υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς] This difficult reading is doubtless prior to the variants, but it can scarcely be right. Wellh. is disposed to favour Mill's conjecture that υἱός is a corruption for the old Greek word ὄϊς (a sheep). Plummer interprets the text as it stands with an emphasis upon ὑμῶν: "which of you yourselves would not rescue your son or even your ox on the sabbath?" Bab. Talm. Baba Qamma v. 6 (Goldschmidt, vi. p. 192) is no true parallel to the B text here, as Klostermann's abbreviated quotation might lead the reader to suppose. The ox and the ass, the son and the daughter are not bracketed together in one phrase. The point there is that if an ox or an ass fall into a well, the owner of the well is responsible for the damage; but if a son or a daughter fall, he is not responsible.

7. ἐπέχων] sc. τὸν νοῦν. Here only in Gospels. Cf. Ac. iii. 5, 1 Ti. iv. 16. Luke describes the discourse which follows as a παραβολή, and this probably gives the correct clue to its interpretation: i.e. it is not

8 πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο, λέγων πρὸς αὐτούς Ὅταν κληθῇς
ὑπό τινος εἰς γάμους, μὴ κατακλιθῇς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν,
9 μή ποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ᾖ κεκλημένος ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ
ἐλθὼν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι Δὸς τούτῳ τόπον,
καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ μετὰ αἰσχύνης τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν.
10 ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν κληθῇς πορευθεὶς ἀνάπεσε εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον,
ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κεκληκώς σε ἐρεῖ σοι Φίλε, προσανάβηθι
ἀνώτερον· τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν συν-
11 ανακειμένων σοι. ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται
12 καὶ ὁ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται. Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ
τῷ κεκληκότι αὐτόν Ὅταν ποιῇς ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον, μὴ
φώνει τοὺς φίλους σου μηδὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου μηδὲ τοὺς
συγγενεῖς σου μηδὲ γείτονας πλουσίους, μή ποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ
13 ἀντικαλέσωσίν σε καὶ γένηται ἀνταπόδομά σοι. ἀλλ᾽
ὅταν δοχὴν ποιῇς, κάλει πτωχούς, ἀναπείρους, χωλούς,

13 *αναπειρους* ℵABD al: *αναπηρους* codd pler. cf. Phryn Bekker p. 9. 22 *ἀναπηρία διὰ τοῦ η τὴν πρώτην οὐ διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου ὡς οἱ ἀμαθεῖς*

a direct injunction as to proper behaviour at a dinner (though this certainly seems to be suggested by the words ἐπέχων . . . ἐξελέγοντο), but the proper behaviour at a feast affords an analogy to the attitude demanded by the Kingdom of God. In the Kingdom the present order of things shall be reversed (*v.* 11), as the self-chosen order of his guests is reversed by the host in the parable. But Wellh., following Jülicher, thinks that the injunction is intended directly: i.e. Jesus here gives a rule of conduct for ordinary life, without any special reference to a religious motive. Luke has wrongly described this as 'a parable,' and wrongly spiritualised it by appending the saying of *v.* 11. It is in favour of Jülicher's view that the form of the address to the guests (*vv.* 8-11) approximates closely to the form of the address to the host (*vv.* 12-14). Cf. *v.* 8 ὅταν κληθῇς . . . μὴ κατακλιθῇς with *v.* 12 ὅταν ποιῇς ἄριστον . . . μὴ φώνει, and the latter address must certainly be interpreted as a direct injunction, not as a parable. But if Jülicher is right, this is, as Wellh. notes, the only example of this kind of 'worldly wisdom' to be found in the Gospels. Cf. the advice in Prov. xxv. 6 μὴ ἀλαζονεύου ἐνώπιον βασιλέως, μηδὲ ἐν τόποις δυναστῶν ὑφίστασο· κρεῖσσον γάρ σοι τὸ ῥηθῆναι Ἀνάβαινε πρός με, ἢ ταπεινῶσαί σε ἐν προσώπῳ δυνάστου. A similar saying is given by 'Western' texts at Mt. xx. 28.

11. This saying recurs at xviii. 14, and it is also found in Mt. xxiii. 12.

12-14. This is not described as a παραβολή. Hospitality should be exercised towards those who cannot repay on earth. Generosity of this kind will be rewarded in the next world. This is the same principle as that laid down at vi. 33 f. On the idea of reward in the teaching of Jesus cf. vi. 23 n.

τυφλούς· καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί 14
σοι, ἀνταποδοθήσεται γάρ σοι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν
δικαίων. Ἀκούσας δέ τις τῶν συνανακειμένων 15
ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῷ Μακάριος ὅστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ
βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἄνθρωπός τις 16
ἐποίει δεῖπνον μέγα, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλούς, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν 17
τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις
Ἔρχεσθε ὅτι ἤδη ἕτοιμά ἐστιν. καὶ ἤρξαντο 18
ἀπὸ μιᾶς πάντες παραιτεῖσθαι. ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ
Ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα καὶ ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἐξελθὼν ἰδεῖν αὐτόν·
ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρῃτημένον. καὶ ἕτερος εἶπεν Ζεύγη 19

15 αρτον ℵABD 1 etc al mult latt syr(vg.hl) aegg ς : αριστον 69 etc 700 al mult syr.vt arm

14. ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων] It is precarious to argue from this that Luke or his source precludes here the thought of the resurrection of the unjust (cf. Ac. xxiv. 15 ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων), or that a distinction is intended (as in Rev. xx.) between a first and a second resurrection. It is merely affirmed that the just will rise to be recompensed.

15. For this pious exclamation cf. xi. 27. This verse effects the transition from the thought of the earthly banquet to the heavenly banquet, which has been prepared for by the reference to the resurrection in *v.* 14.

16. ἄνθρωπός τις] In Mt. xxii. it is a king who sends out servants (plural) to bid the guests to the marriage feast of his son. This appears to be an allegorizing expansion of a simple form of the story such as that here given by Luke. In Mt. the servants may be interpreted as the apostles whom God sends out to bid the guests to the marriage-feast of the Christ (so Wellh.). Luke does not allegorize, and it is probably a mistake to ask here who is represented by the δοῦλος. It was a recognised custom to send a servant to repeat the invitation at the appointed time. Cf. Esther vi. 14; Terence, *Hauton.* 169; Apul. *Met.* iii. 12. "Et ecce quidam introcurrens famulus: 'rogat te,' ait, 'tua parens Byrrhena, et convivii, cui te sero desponderas, iam adpropinquantis admonet.'" To refuse, when finally summoned, an invitation which had already been accepted would be an act of gross discourtesy.

18 f. The excuses are very graphically described. Mt. says simply that they went away, one to his farm and another to his merchandise. The man who had married a wife appears only in Lk.

18. ἀπὸ μιᾶς] ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. Prob. γνώμης or some other such word should be supplied. Cf. Arist. *Lys.* 1000. But acc. to Wellh. it is an Aramaism for *min ch'da* 'all at once.' Cf. P.B. *s.v.*

ἔχε με παρῃτημένον] Perhaps a Latinism. Cf. Martial ii. 79 "excusatum habeas me rogo." But attested for the Greek vernacular. Ox. Pap. 292. 6 διὸ παρακαλῶ σε . . . ἔχειν αὐτὸν συνεσταμένον.

*βοῶν ἠγόρασα πέντε καὶ πορεύομαι δοκιμάσαι αὐτά· ἐρωτῶ*
20 *σε, ἔχε με παρῃτημένον. καὶ ἕτερος εἶπεν Γυναῖκα ἔγημα*
21 *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν. καὶ παραγενόμενος ὁ*
*δοῦλος ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα. τότε ὀργισθεὶς*
*ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἶπεν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἔξελθε ταχέως εἰς*
*τὰς πλατείας καὶ ῥύμας τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ*
22 *ἀναπείρους καὶ τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς εἰσάγαγε ὧδε. καὶ*
*εἶπεν ὁ δοῦλος Κύριε, γέγονεν ὃ ἐπέταξας, καὶ ἔτι τόπος*
23 *ἐστίν. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον Ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς*
*ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς καὶ ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν, ἵνα γεμισθῇ*
24 *μου ὁ οἶκος· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων*
*τῶν κεκλημένων γεύσεταί μου τοῦ δείπνου.*

20. The more emphatic refusal of the man who had married a wife answers to the circumstance of his condition. Acc. to Deut. xxiv. 5 (cf. *ib.* xx. 7) a newly married man is released from all military duty and other business for the space of a year. Cf. also Hdt. i. 36.

21. The well-to-do guests having excused themselves, their place is to be taken by the outcast and the afflicted. The Pharisees and the religious leaders having rejected their opportunity, they are replaced by 'the publicans and sinners.' The new guests are described in the same terms as those whom the host has been bidden to invite to his table, *v.* 13.

22. *καὶ ἔτι τόπος ἐστίν*] Not so in Mt., where the hall is filled by the guests, 'both bad and good,' who are collected by the second invitation. In Lk. the host dispatches his servant a third time; this time he is to go into the highways and hedges outside the city to fill the places which are still vacant. This symbolizes the expansion of the Church outside the limits of the nation. The catholic invitation to the world supersedes the limited invitation to the Jews. Luke does not give the somewhat incongruous addition of Mt. that "the king sent his armies and destroyed those murderers, and burnt up their city" (xxii. 7), nor does he include the Matthaean pendant of the guest who entered without a wedding garment.

23. *ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν*] 'urge,' 'press.' This is the verse to which Augustine appealed to justify compulsion in religion, *c. Gaud. Don.* i. 25, 28. But the idea of literal compulsion is not at all suggested.

24. *λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν*] A very curious yet natural transition. The plural *ὑμῖν* shews that the speaker is no longer the host in conversation with his servant. Moreover, from the point of view of the parable, it would hardly be appropriate that the host should thus pronounce sentence upon guests who have debarred themselves. The speaker is now Jesus (cf. xi. 8, xv. 7, 10, xvi. 9, xviii. 14, Mt. xxi. 43), and he is foretelling, in direct speech, the displacement of those originally invited to the Messianic banquet by the new converts to the faith. The picture is the same as xiii. 28, 29.

### THE CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP (xiv. 25-35)

These verses state a truth complementary to the preceding. We have been shewn that the invitation to the Kingdom is scattered far and wide. The condition of having received one of the original invitations is abrogated. But there is another and sterner condition of discipleship—the condition of renunciation. The transition in thought is somewhat similar to that in the last chapter, *v.* 21 f., where, after the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven which portray the expansion of the preaching of the Kingdom, we pass on to the words "Strive to enter in through the narrow door."

The two sayings in *vv.* 26, 27 are paralleled in Mt. x. 37, 38 (the charge to the Twelve). The theme is the call for renunciation, and this theme is resumed at *v.* 33. The intervening parables are peculiar to Luke. They have affinity in idea with the sayings which precede in that, like them, they teach that a great achievement needs a corresponding preparation. But the peculiar point of the parables represents an advance upon *vv.* 26, 27, and this point is not fairly brought out by the concluding verse 33 (οὕτως οὖν κτλ.). As Jülicher rightly observes (*Gleichnisreden*, ii. pp. 208 f.), if the parables are to be brought into line with the moral which is deduced from them, they should rather run: A man who has begun to build a tower must, if he would escape ridicule, throw all his reserves into its completion. A king who is about to encounter another and more powerful king must strain every nerve to make his own army fit for the battle. So also he who would be my disciple must bid good-bye to all his possessions. The actual point of the parables is different, viz. the need for calculation before undertaking a great task. Their immediate object is to discourage a hasty enthusiasm rather than directly to call out self-sacrifice. Perhaps, as Jülicher suggests, the parables followed the preceding sayings in Luke's source, and the evangelist himself inserted the connecting γάρ in *v.* 28 and appended *v.* 33—not quite happily—to resume the whole. Verses 34, 35 continue the theme of discipleship. The true disciple is as salt; the half-hearted disciple, like tasteless salt, is worse than useless.

*Συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ στραφεὶς* 25

25. ὄχλοι πολλοί] The gathering of the multitudes answers to the universalistic note of the last parable, and forms the background of the stern sayings which follow. The similar sayings in Mk. viii. 34 are addressed to the multitude, but in Mt. x. the setting of the sayings is different. "In Luke the sayings receive a distinctive and certainly not an unhistorical illumination from the introduction of *v.* 25. The masses

26 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρός με καὶ οὐ μισεῖ
τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ
τέκνα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀδελφάς, ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν
27 ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής. ὅστις οὐ
βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ
28 δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής. τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν θέλων
πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας ψηφίζει τὴν
29 δαπάνην, εἰ ἔχει εἰς ἀπαρτισμόν; ἵνα μή ποτε θέντος αὐτοῦ
θεμέλιον καὶ μὴ ἰσχύοντος ἐκτελέσαι πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντες
30 ἄρξωνται αὐτῷ ἐμπαίζειν λέγοντες ὅτι Οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρω-
31 πος ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἐκτελέσαι. ἢ τίς
βασιλεὺς πορευόμενος ἑτέρῳ βασιλεῖ συνβαλεῖν εἰς πόλεμον

who attach themselves to Jesus, as represented in Luke or his source (xix. 11, 37), regard the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem as a triumphal progress, at the end of which there glimmers the kingdom of God. They all regard themselves as disciples of Jesus who are to be led by him to glory. This conception of discipleship is to be damped down by the words which follow: for the way of Jesus is the way of renunciation and of the cross" (J. Weiss).

26. οὐ μισεῖ] a hyperbolè. The meaning is that given in the tamer version of Mt., "he who loveth father or mother more than me." The kinsfolk mentioned in Mt. are father, mother, son and daughter. The addition of 'wife' in Luke is noteworthy. So again xviii. 21, and cf. xiv. 20 *supra*. ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ is probably taken by Luke from another saying which followed in his source as it does still in Mt. x. 39: ὁ εὑρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν κτλ.

οὐ δύναται . . . μαθητής] Again stronger than Mt. οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.

27. The sight of criminals carrying their crosses will have been familiar, and might be supposed without difficulty to have provided Jesus with a metaphor. But apart from its association with his own cross the metaphor would not have been appropriate. It is the combination of the gallows and the Messiahship which is significant, and this combination was effected by Jesus himself. The saying must have taken shape in the community. The disciples must, through great tribulation, enter the kingdom of God (Acts xiv. 22), following Jesus without the camp, bearing his reproach (Heb. xiii. 13).

28. πύργον] Perhaps a tower for his vineyard, cf. Mk. xii. 1. So Jülicher, Loisy. But the 'foundation' and the expense suggest something more elaborate. Lagrange quotes Horace, "pauperum tabernas, regumque turres." Cf. Jos. *B.J.* v. 4. 2. καθίσας] He sits to make a deliberate calculation. ψηφίζει] Elsewhere in N.T. only Rev. xiii. 18. δαπάνη and ἀπαρτισμός here only in N.T.

ἀπαρτισμός—a very rare word, quoted from Dion. Hal. *De comp. verb*. c. 24. It is also found in a papyrus of the early second century, in a similar sense to that of this passage, of the completion of building operations. *Giessen-pap*. 67. 9.

οὐχὶ καθίσας πρῶτον βουλεύσεται εἰ δυνατός ἐστιν ἐν δέκα
χιλιάσιν ὑπαντῆσαι τῷ μετὰ εἴκοσι χιλιάδων ἐρχομένῳ
ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν; εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἔτι αὐτοῦ πόρρω ὄντος πρεσβείαν 32
ἀποστείλας ἐρωτᾷ πρὸς εἰρήνην. οὕτως οὖν πᾶς ἐξ ὑμῶν 33
ὃς οὐκ ἀποτάσσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν οὐ
δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής. Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ 34
καὶ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται; οὔτε εἰς γῆν 35

32 *προς ειρηνην* ℵΓ : *τα προς ειρηνην* ADL codd pler ϛ : *εις ειρηνην* B 482 : *τα εις ειρηνην* KΠ al plus 10

32. *πρεσβείαν*] Abstract for concrete: 'ambassadors.' Cf. *θεραπεία* xii. 42.

*ἐρωτᾷ πρὸς εἰρήνην*] Hort for once deserts B. But the reading of B *ἐρωτᾷ εἰς εἰρήνην* is more difficult Greek and probably more original than the variants. Cf. Thackeray in *J.Th.S.* xiv. pp. 389 f. *ἐρωτᾶν εἰς εἰρήνην* or *τὰ εἰς εἰρήνην* is translation Greek in the later books of the LXX for שָׁאַל לְשָׁלוֹם 'to ask after a person's health,' 'to greet,' 'to salute.' Judg. xviii. 15b; 1 Regn. x. 4, xvii. 22a, xxv. 5, xxx. 21b. "The insertion of *τά* was a slight accommodation of the Hebraism to Greek syntax." When used in connexion with royalty the corresponding phrase in other Semitic languages and in ancient Egyptian bears the special meaning 'to do homage,' 'to tender one's allegiance,' and this special meaning is found in Heb. (LXX *ἐρωτᾶν τὰ εἰς εἰρήνην*), 2 Regn. viii. 10. That this passage (the submission of King Toi to King David) was actually here in mind, as Thackeray suggests, is perhaps not probable, but it may be taken to establish the meaning of the phrase as used here, i.e. 'to submit.'

34-35. Salt is good provided it retains its peculiar properties, but if it lose them it is worse than useless. The saying is to be connected with what precedes. Salt answers to the distinctive quality of a true disciple. This interpretation is made explicit in Mt. v. 13 *ὑμεῖς ἔστε τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς κτλ.* The Matthaean form of the saying is prob. a paraphrase made to adapt it to its setting, cf. v. 14 *ὑμεῖς ἔστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου.* Lk. may be supposed to preserve the Q form. The words *ἐὰν δὲ . . . μωρανθῇ* (om. *καί* Mt.) are common to Mt. and Lk. For *οὔτε εἰς γῆν . . . βάλλουσιν αὐτό* Mt. gives *εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι εἰ μὴ βληθὲν ἔξω καταπατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.* The former half of the saying is also given in Mk. ix. 50, where it begins as here *καλὸν τὸ ἅλας.* In Mk. the interpretation of the verse in relation to its context is very obscure, and perhaps for this reason was omitted by Mt. and Lk. at the corresponding place in their Gospels. In Mt. the use of salt for manuring purposes appears to be the thought throughout. Here it is perhaps probable that the use of salt as a preservative for food is thought of in the first clause: "Salt is good (as a preservative or condiment), but tasteless salt is useless—even for manure." *οὔτε εἰς γῆν οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν*] i.e. it is useless to put it on the land forthwith or to keep it on the manure-heap for future use. Perles (*Z.N.T.W.*, 1920, p. 96) ingeniously suggests that *εἰς γῆν* is due to *οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν εὔθετόν ἐστιν· ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτό. Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.*

a misreading of the Aramaic תַּבֵּל 'to season' for the Biblical (and Aramaic) תֵּבֵל 'earth.' The meaning then would be: 'it is useless either as a condiment or as manure.' But the conjecture (regarded as improbable by Lagrange) appears unnecessary. The use of salt for manure is a well-attested practice for Egypt and Palestine, both in ancient and in modern times. Cf. Gressmann in *Th. Lit. Z.*, 1911, pp. 156 f.

### God's Welcome for the Penitent (xv.)

Three parables to illustrate from human behaviour God's attitude towards the penitent. The second and third parables ('the lost coin' and 'the two sons') are found in this Gospel alone. The parable of the lost sheep occurs also in Matthew (xviii. 12-13), where, however, its setting is clearly secondary and editorial. See *v.* 7 n.

In Luke the first two parables are closely similar in form and doubtless formed a pair in the source, like the two parables in the preceding chapter (xiv. 25 f.) and 'the mustard seed' and 'the leaven' (xiii. 18 f.). The loss of a possession enhances our sense of its value, and a successful search gives us keener happiness than the possession of other similar goods which we have never lost. So is it in heaven, when God wins back a repentant sinner. The parable of the two sons which follows is slightly distinguished from the preceding parables by a separate word of introduction (*εἶπεν δέ*, *v.* 11). It continues the leading thought of the other two, but the repentant sinner who before appeared only in the interpretation of the parable (*vv.* 7, 10) now takes concrete form in the parable itself. In place of a lost sheep or a lost coin we have now a lost son. This gives an intimacy and a directness to this parable which is lacking to the others. In no other passage, we feel, does Luke enter more deeply into a picture which he has reproduced and possibly himself filled out. The glad tidings of God's love for the penitent sinner proclaimed by Jesus is the evangelist's favourite theme, and into this parable that theme is concentrated.

Wellhausen holds that the story of the elder brother is an appendix which does not belong to the original story. "The comparison of the two brothers which is presented in xv. 25 f. expresses a motif on which no stress is laid in xv. 11-24. There there is no comparison, and we ask as little about the attitude of the elder brother as we do about the attitude of the ninety-nine sheep and the nine drachmae." The theory is supported by certain inconsistencies in the story as it stands (cf. *v.* 12 n.). But these inconsistencies are not sufficient to weaken our impression that the father and each of his sons are all three essential to the story as a whole. The opening words prepare us for both parts of the parable. No doubt there is a difference from the parables which precede, but Wellhausen fails to note that in the other parables we hear as little of the attitude of the counterparts to the younger brother (the lost sheep and the lost coin) as we do of the counterparts to the elder brother. There is a similar development from the preceding parables in both parts of the parable of the two sons.

It is noteworthy that the repentant prodigal is at once received back to his father's love. Repentance on the son's part calls forth of itself the father's forgivenness. Nothing suggests that a mediator is needed between the erring son and his father. It is urged by some critics that here we have the original Gospel teaching on repentance and forgiveness—a teaching which has been later overlaid by the Church's doctrine of remission of sins in virtue of Christ's death upon the cross. Others have replied that we must not look for all the factors in a deep problem in one picture; the parable of the prodigal son on the lips of another than Jesus, and unbalanced by his teachings on judgement and renunciation, might be misleading. Without entering into these discussions here, it may be noted that Luke appears nowhere to associate the remission of sins directly with Christ's death.

Luke's interpretation of the immediate intention of the parable is given by his opening verse: the younger son represents the publicans and sinners, and the elder brother the self-righteous Pharisees. And this no doubt is true to the mind and attitude of Jesus. It was a natural extension of the original idea that the younger son should be taken to mean the converted pagans and the elder brother the Jews. It was probably because he inherited and assumed this interpretation that Marcion excised the parable: he was unable to allow that *vv.* 29 and 31 could describe the attitude of the Father of Jesus Christ to the people of the Old Covenant. The parable was frequently used in justification of the disciplinary action of the Church in readmitting the lapsed on their penitence. (So by Clement, Ambrose, and others; cf. Zahn, p. 565 n. 72.) Tertullian as a Montanist (*De pudic.* 8, 9) warmly contests the justice of this view and interprets the younger son as typifying mankind, first sunk in heathen darkness and then redeemed through Christ.

XV. 1 Ησαν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐγγίζοντες πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ
2 ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. καὶ διεγόγγυζον οἵ τε Φαρισαῖοι
καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες ὅτι Οὗτος ἁμαρτωλοὺς προσ-
3 δέχεται καὶ συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν
4 παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγων Τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων
ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ ἀπολέσας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓν οὐ καταλείπει
τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ
5 ἀπολωλὸς ἕως εὕρῃ αὐτό; καὶ εὑρὼν ἐπιτίθησιν ἐπὶ τοὺς
6 ὤμους αὐτοῦ χαίρων, καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον συνκαλεῖ
τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς γείτονας, λέγων αὐτοῖς Συνχάρητέ
7 μοι ὅτι εὗρον τὸ πρόβατόν μου τὸ ἀπολωλός. λέγω ὑμῖν
ὅτι οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ
μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν
8 ἔχουσιν μετανοίας. Ἢ τίς γυνὴ δραχμὰς ἔχουσα δέκα, ἐὰν
ἀπολέσῃ δραχμὴν μίαν, οὐχὶ ἅπτει λύχνον καὶ σαροῖ τὴν
9 οἰκίαν καὶ ζητεῖ ἐπιμελῶς ἕως οὗ εὕρῃ; καὶ εὑροῦσα συν-
καλεῖ τὰς φίλας καὶ γείτονας λέγουσα Συνχάρητέ μοι
10 ὅτι εὗρον τὴν δραχμὴν ἣν ἀπώλεσα. οὕτως, λέγω ὑμῖν,
γίνεται χαρὰ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρ-
11 τωλῷ μετανοοῦντι. Εἶπεν δὲ Ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχεν
12 δύο υἱούς. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ νεώτερος αὐτῶν τῷ πατρί Πάτερ,
δός μοι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας· ὁ δὲ διεῖλεν

1. Cf. v. 30 (= Mk. ii. 16).

2. διαγογγύζω. The compound in N.T. only here and xix. 7.

4. ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ] In Mt. ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη.

5. ἐπιτίθησιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὤμους] Not in Mt. Cf. Is. xl. 11, xlix. 22.

6. The invitation to friends and neighbours is not given by Mt.

7. The moral springs clearly from the parable. In Mt. the parable has been introduced under the heading ὁρᾶτε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἑνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων (xviii. 10), and the moral drawn from it is: οὕτως οὐκ ἔστιν θέλημα ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μικρῶν τούτων. This seems further from the thought of the parable than the conclusion given here.

8. δραχμάς] The Greek silver drachma. Mentioned here only in N.T., but cf. δίδραχμον Mt. xvii. 24.

10. ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ] i.e. the court of heaven. But cf. xii. 8 n.

12. τὸ ἐπιβάλλον] 'that falls to me.' A regular formula. See the papyrus quoted Deissmann, *L.E.* p. 166 n. 5. Besides testamentary disposition of property, later Jewish law recognised disposition by gift in a man's life-time. Unlike a will,

αὐτοῖς τὸν βίον. καὶ μετ᾽ οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συναγαγὼν 13
πάντα ὁ νεώτερος υἱὸς ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς χώραν μακράν, καὶ
ἐκεῖ διεσκόρπισεν τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ ζῶν ἀσώτως. δαπα- 14
νήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἰσχυρὰ κατὰ τὴν
χώραν ἐκείνην, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι. καὶ πορευ- 15
θεὶς ἐκολλήθη ἑνὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τῆς χώρας ἐκείνης, καὶ
ἔπεμψεν αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς αὐτοῦ βόσκειν χοίρους· καὶ 16
ἐπεθύμει χορτασθῆναι ἐκ τῶν κερατίων ὧν ἤσθιον οἱ χοῖροι,
καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ. εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν ἔφη Πόσοι 17

16 χορτασθηναι εκ ℵBDL 1-131 69 etc e f syr.cur sah pal: γεμισαι την κοιλιαν αυτου απο A al pler b c q vg syrr(sin.vg.hl) boh arm ϛ

such a disposition was irrevocable. By this method of dealing with property, an owner was not tied by the provisions of the law as to inheritance (Numb. xxvii. 8 f.), and a son might even be disinherited. See S.B. iii. pp. 545 f. (on Gal. iii. 15). But in such cases the gift only became realisable at the death of the owner, i.e. the capital became the property of the recipient forthwith, but he did not enjoy the interest until the owner's death (*ib.* p. 551). S.B. therefore appear not to be right in citing this passage as an example of the procedure described (p. 549), for here it is clear that the younger son takes possession at once of his capital. But that this was not itself an unheard-of procedure is shewn by Ecclus. xxxiii. 19 f. (xxx. 28 f.), where a father is warned against parting with his goods, "for it is better that thy children ask of thee than that thou shouldest look to the hand of thy sons."

διεῖλεν αὐτοῖς] There appears to be some inconsistency between this statement and the later part of the parable (*vv.* 29-31), where the elder son has not received his share but is still working for his father on the estate. We must not ask too many questions.

13. συναγαγών] Wettst. quotes a striking parallel from Plut. *Cat. Minor*, p. 772 C κληρονομίαν . . . εἰς ἀργύριον συναγαγών, which suggests the possibility that συναγαγών here may connote the idea of 'realising' his estate.

ἀσώτως] Good Greek. Here only in the Greek Bible. ἀσωτία Eph. v. 18, Tit. i. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 4. A good parallel to this verse is quoted from pap. Flor. 99. 6 f. ἐπεὶ ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν Κάστωρ μεθ᾽ ἑτέρων (ἑταιρῶν Zahn) ἀσωτευόμενος ἐσπάνισε τὰ αὑτοῦ πάντα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἡμῶν μεταβὰς βούλεται ἀπολέσαι κτλ.

14. ἰσχυρά] A standing Greek epithet of λιμός. Cf. Thuc. iii. 85 and other exx. in Wettst.

15. βόσκειν χοίρους] A degrading occupation, especially for a Jew. Cf. an old saying in Baba Qamma VII. vii. (Goldschmidt, vi. p. 298) "Cursed is the man who breeds swine, and cursed is the man who teaches his son Greek wisdom."

16. κερατίων] Pods of the carob-tree, *Ceratonia siliqua*, which still grows freely in Palestine and around the Mediterranean.

17. εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθών] A common Greek (and Latin) idiom, cf. Wettst. *ad loc.* "The Jews say To return to God," Wellh.

μίσθιοι τοῦ πατρός μου περισσεύονται ἄρτων, ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ
18 ὧδε ἀπόλλυμαι· ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα
μου καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτῷ Πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ
19 ἐνώπιόν σου, οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου· ποίησόν
20 με ὡς ἕνα τῶν μισθίων σου. Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἦλθεν πρὸς τὸν
πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ. ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος εἶδεν
αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη καὶ δραμὼν ἐπέπεσεν
ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν.
21 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτῷ Πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου[· ποί-
22 ησόν με ὡς ἕνα τῶν μισθίων σου]. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ
πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ Ταχὺ ἐξενέγκατε στολὴν τὴν
πρώτην καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτόν, καὶ δότε δακτύλιον εἰς τὴν
23 χεῖρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποδήματα εἰς τοὺς πόδας, καὶ φέρετε τὸν
μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν, θύσατε καὶ φαγόντες εὐφρανθῶμεν,
24 ὅτι οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησεν, ἦν ἀπολωλὼς
25 καὶ εὑρέθη. Καὶ ἤρξαντο εὐφραίνεσθαι. ἦν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ
ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν ἀγρῷ· καὶ ὡς ἐρχόμενος ἤγγισεν τῇ οἰκίᾳ,
26 ἤκουσεν συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν, καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ἕνα
27 τῶν παίδων ἐπυνθάνετο τί ἂν εἴη ταῦτα· ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ

21 *υιος σου*] add *ποιησον με ως ενα των μισθιων σου* ℵBD 700 al syr.hl : om ALΘ 1 etc 69 etc al pler latt syrr(vt.vg) arm aegg Aug ϛ

*μίσθιοι*] Here only in N.T. *περισσεύονται ἄρτων*] It is very natural that the prodigal should first be stirred by the memory of the material comforts enjoyed by his father's servants.

18. *εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*] A Jewish periphrasis for *εἰς τὸν θεόν*.

21, 22. Before he has time to make his request, the father interrupts him. The addition of *ποίησον . . . μισθίων σου*, though attested by the best uncials, may be rejected with some confidence as an interpolation from *v.* 19.

22. *τὴν πρώτην*] 'the best,' 'of the first quality,' cf. Ez. xxvii. 22 *μετὰ πρώτων ἡδυσμάτων καὶ λίθων χρηστῶν*. The use is also found in idiomatic Greek: Athen. v. 197 b *ἁλουργεῖς . . . τῆς πρώτης ἐρέας*.

24. Note the parallelism. No marked distinction of meaning between the two members is to be looked for.

25. *συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν*] 'music and dancing.' Two *ἅπαξ λεγ.* in N.T. Cf. Suet. *Calig.* 37 "discumbens de die inter choros et symphonias," and numerous other quotations in Wettst. But *συμφωνία* here perhaps refers to a specific wind instrument as in Dan. iii. 5, 15. So Wellh. Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* xxi. 29 "male autem quidam de Latinis symphoniam putant esse genus organi."

27. *εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι*] *ὅτι* recitative.

ὅτι Ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἥκει, καὶ ἔθυσεν ὁ πατήρ σου τὸν
μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν, ὅτι ὑγιαίνοντα αὐτὸν ἀπέλαβεν.
ὠργίσθη δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν εἰσελθεῖν. ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ 28
ἐξελθὼν παρεκάλει αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ πατρὶ 29
αὐτοῦ Ἰδοὺ τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐντολήν
σου παρῆλθον, καὶ ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔδωκας ἔριφον
ἵνα μετὰ τῶν φίλων μου εὐφρανθῶ· ὅτε δὲ ὁ υἱός σου 30
οὗτος ὁ καταφαγών σου τὸν βίον μετὰ πορνῶν ἦλθεν,
ἔθυσας αὐτῷ τὸν σιτευτὸν μόσχον. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ 31
Τέκνον, σὺ πάντοτε μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σά
ἐστιν· εὐφρανθῆναι δὲ καὶ χαρῆναι ἔδει, ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου 32
οὗτος νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἔζησεν, καὶ ἀπολωλὼς καὶ εὑρέθη.

29. This is hard to reconcile with the statement in *v.* 12. See also *v.* 31.

30. μετὰ πορνῶν] The elder brother expresses his abhorrence with a coarse brutality. We are not told and must not ask how tidings of his younger brother's fortunes had reached him.

32. For the refrain cf. *v.* 24.

## The Use and Abuse of Money (xvi. 1-13)

The paragraph (peculiar to Luke, except *v.* 13) presents well-known difficulties. It is in the first place obvious that the parable of the unjust steward is a parable in the strict sense: i.e. it is not, like the stories of the Good Samaritan, or the Pharisee and the Publican, a picture of conduct which is directly commended or reprobated, but it is a story from ordinary life in the world which is shewn to have a counterpart in the spiritual world. The master does not correspond to God, nor does his steward correspond to a disciple, and the flagrant dishonesty of the steward's procedure only comes into the question in so far as it enhances his skilful use of worldly opportunity to secure his worldly end. The characters no more serve to immediate edification than the reluctant friend (xi. 8) or the unjust judge (xviii. 2). The emphasis falls upon the steward's 'prudence,' and an analogous 'prudence' in another sphere is enjoined upon the disciples.

But the parable, taken with the subsequent sayings, appears to be intended to commend prudence of a specific kind, viz. prudence in the use of wealth. This is the point of *v.* 9 which clearly refers back to *v.* 4 of the parable: as the unrighteous steward made use of his financial opportunities to secure his future when he had lost his post, so are the disciples to use the 'unrighteous mammon' (i.e. wealth which is, in its own nature, 'unrighteous') which comes to them, to secure a habitation in the eternal tabernacles, when wealth—with all else that belongs to this world—shall have failed. The sayings which follow continue the theme of the use of wealth, and, in the case of *v.* 10, the saying is possibly intended to guard against a misinterpretation of the parable. The concluding saying, *v.* 13 (|| Mt. vi. 24), comes no doubt from Q. It seems to be attached here because of the reference to mammon. But the point is quite different from that of the preceding sayings: not the right use of mammon, in view of the world to come, but the impossibility of serving mammon and God, is the moral taught.

The blessedness of poverty (vi. 20) and injunctions to part with all worldly possessions (xii. 33) are themes which we have already found in passages peculiar (in form at any rate) to this Gospel, and a similar attitude lies behind the parable of Dives and Lazarus below; on the *prima facie* interpretation the parable of the unjust steward harmonises with these other passages. Nevertheless it is questioned by some critics whether the parable of the unjust steward was originally concerned to point the particular moral of prudence in the use of mammon (as is certainly implied in *v.* 9) and not rather prudence in general. J. Weiss, who adopts this view on literary grounds to be noted shortly, compares the saying of Mt. x. 16 "Be ye wise (φρόνιμοι) as serpents." The serpent is not more attractive as an animal than the unjust steward as a specimen of human kind, yet both represent a quality which has a legitimate and essential place in the character of the disciple, viz. prudence. Prudence in the attainment of an end is, in itself, a quality to be admired, even in a dishonest servant. If the parable stopped at *v.* 8 this is the interpretation that we should naturally adopt. It is *v.* 9 which introduces the idea of the use of wealth into the application. Jülicher (ii. p. 505) and J. Weiss both regard *v.* 9 as a later pendant, and the curious literary construction of *vv.* 8, 9 give some support to this conclusion. Who is ὁ κύριος in *v.* 8? If it is the lord of the steward (*v.* 3) it is at least remarkable that he should 'praise' his dishonest servant's 'prudence,' and further, a very awkward transition is involved in the remaining half of the verse which cannot possibly represent the sentiments of the steward's master, but must be intended for the comment of Jesus. These difficulties are avoided if we interpret ὁ κύριος in *v.* 8 of Jesus; cf. xviii. 6. But it is hard to suppose that the evangelist himself intended this, in view of the sudden transition to the first person in *v.* 9. Wellhausen, who holds that the parable always and throughout teaches the proper use of mammon, interprets ὁ κύριος of Jesus and regards the second ὅτι of *v.* 8 as the equivalent of *lemor*, 'saying,' so that 8b and 9 are continuous direct speech giving the context of Jesus' words of approval. Wellhausen compares xviii. 6 f. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος Ἀκούσατε . . . λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι . . . But this parallel, though striking so far as it goes, does not support the difficult interpretation of the second ὅτι, which, after the intervening clause ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν, it is hard not to translate 'for' or 'because.' These problems are certainly eased if, with Jülicher and J. Weiss, we suppose *v.* 9 to be a later addition, and on this hypothesis the interpretation of the parable as teaching the prudent use of wealth is secondary. I am unable to understand why Bultmann should think *v.* 8 also to be secondary (*G.S.T.* p. 109). Some indication must always have been needed as to where a moral was to be found in this unedifying story.

*Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς Ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν* 1 XVI
*πλούσιος ὃς εἶχεν οἰκονόμον, καὶ οὗτος διεβλήθη αὐτῷ ὡς*
*διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. καὶ φωνήσας αὐτὸν* 2
*εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον*
*τῆς οἰκονομίας σου, οὐ γὰρ δύνῃ ἔτι οἰκονομεῖν. εἶπεν* 3
*δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ οἰκονόμος Τί ποιήσω ὅτι ὁ κύριός μου*
*ἀφαιρεῖται τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; σκάπτειν οὐκ ἰσχύω,*
*ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι· ἔγνων τί ποιήσω, ἵνα ὅταν μετα-* 4
*σταθῶ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας δέξωνταί με εἰς τοὺς οἴκους ἑαυτῶν.*
*καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ἕνα ἕκαστον τῶν χρεοφιλετῶν τοῦ* 5

1. *ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς*] *καί* probably indicates that the scene remains the same. The previous parables had been addressed to the Pharisees. Jesus now addresses the disciples. But the Pharisees are still to be thought of as in the background, for they overhear what is said, and by their mockery call forth a further rebuke (*v.* 14). *πλούσιος*] Attribute, not predicate.

2. *τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ;*] 'What is this that I hear about you?' not 'Why do I hear this about you?' The abbreviated form (for *τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὅ κτλ.*) is probably a Semitism. Cf. Gen. xlii. 28 *τί τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν;* *δύνῃ*] For this form cf. Mk. ix. 22; Rev. ii. 2. It is rejected by Phryn. cccxxxvii.

3. The steward's reflections are expressed in soliloquy; cf. xii. 17, where the form of the soliloquy is closely similar to this: *Τί ποιήσω; . . . καὶ εἶπεν Τοῦτο ποιήσω.*

*σκάπτειν οὐκ ἰσχύω*] Proverbial. Cf. Aristoph. *Birds* 1432 *τί γὰρ πάθω; σκάπτειν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι*, and other passages in Wettst.

*ἐπαιτεῖν*] 'to beg.' In Gk. from Homer onwards. In N.T. only here and xviii. 35.

4. *ἔγνων*] *Aoristus tragicus*, 'I am decided.' A sudden idea comes to him. *δέξωνται*] The construction is awkward. We must understand from what follows *οἱ χρεοφιλέται* as subject.

5. *ἕνα ἕκαστον*] The two cases which follow are to be regarded as

κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ ἔλεγεν τῷ πρώτῳ Πόσον ὀφείλεις τῷ
6 κυρίῳ μου; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἑκατὸν βάτους ἐλαίου· ὁ δὲ εἶπεν
αὐτῷ Δέξαι σου τὰ γράμματα καὶ καθίσας ταχέως
7 γράψον πεντήκοντα. ἔπειτα ἑτέρῳ εἶπεν Σὺ δὲ πόσον
ὀφείλεις; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἑκατὸν κόρους σίτου· λέγει αὐτῷ
8 Δέξαι σου τὰ γράμματα καὶ γράψον ὀγδοήκοντα. καὶ
ἐπῄνεσεν ὁ κύριος τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας ὅτι φρονίμως
ἐποίησεν· ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ
τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσίν.
9 Καὶ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε φίλους ἐκ τοῦ

typical of the steward's dealings with the debtors. The relationship between the debtors and the steward's master is not entirely clear. Did they owe dues in kind to the master as landlord (cf. xx. 10), or are they in debt to the master for produce which they have themselves received from the estate? It is in favour of the latter hypothesis that the steward holds acknowledgements of the debtors' receipts in their own handwriting.

*πόσον ὀφείλεις*] The question is perhaps designed to convey information to the reader rather than to the steward. But it serves to emphasise the extent of the debtor's obligation to the steward.

*βάτους*] Heb. בַּת. A liquid measure containing about 8¾ gallons. Here only in N.T.

6. The steward hands to the debtor the acknowledgement which he holds and invites the debtor to falsify his figure.

7. *κόρους*] Heb. כֹּר. A dry measure amounting to about 10 bushels. Here only in N.T.

*ὀγδοήκοντα*] The difference in the figure (*πεντήκοντα v.* 6) will be merely intended to give variety.

8. *τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας*] Gen. for adj. as in Heb. Cf. *v.* 9 and xviii. 6.

*οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*] Those who belong entirely to this present age, as contrasted with those who look for the age to come. Cf. xx. 36 *τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες* (a Lucan insertion) and Mt. xiii. 38.

*τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτός*] As contrasted with this present age of darkness, the age to come may be thought of as 'light' and its citizens as 'sons of light.' The phrase is not found elsewhere in the synoptic Gospels, and according to S.B. it is not rabbinic. But cf. Jo. xii. 36; 1 Thess. v. 5; Eph. v. 8.

*εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν*] The phrase suits well 'the sons of this age' who are concerned to adapt themselves to the men of their own generation. We must not try to find too close an analogy in the case of the 'sons of light.' Cf. the next verse and note.

9. On the connexion of this verse with the preceding see the Introd. "As men may, according to the Gospel, lay up treasure in heaven by giving alms, so may they also thereby make friends in heaven. Yet there is here no thought of heavenly patrons, other than God himself—least of all of the poor and of the recipients of the alms, who have come into heaven" (Wellh.).

*ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας*] 'the

μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς
τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς. ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ 10
πιστός ἐστιν, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος καὶ ἐν πολλῷ
ἄδικός ἐστιν. εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ 11
ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει; καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ 12
ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἡμέτερον τίς δώσει
ὑμῖν; Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ 13

9 εκλιπη (vel εκλειπη) ℵ*B*DAΘ 1 etc 69 al a (defecerint e cum boh$^{codd}$) syrr arm aegg Clem ½ Cyr: εκλιπητε (vel εκλειπητε) ℵ$^{ca}$ al mult latt syr.hl Clem ½ Method Chry Iren (lat) Orig (lat) ϛ 12 ημετερον BL Orig: εμον 157 e i l Tert: υμετερον ℵAD codd et verss pler Bas Cyr Orig (lat) Cypr ϛ

unrighteous mammon,' which does not properly belong to man at all. We have here a close analogy to the thought of the parable, as Wellh. points out. As the unjust steward used 'wisely' the property which was not his own, so are the disciples to use 'wisely' the wealth of this world, to which they have no proper claim.

ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ] i.e. when wealth, with all worldly things, fails, either by the coming of the new age, or by the death of the individual. The latter thought probably predominates, cf. xii. 20, and the meaning is not essentially different from that of the inferior reading ὅταν ἐκλίπητε.

δέξωνται] Cf. δέξωνται *v.* 4, but the subject here is really God. The grammatical subject is possibly 'angels' used as a periphrasis for God, or more probably the 3rd person plural active is simply an equivalent for the passive, and is used as though it were the passive, to avoid naming God; cf. *Joma* viii. 9, "He who says, I will sin and then turn myself . . . to him *give they* no opportunity to perform penitence," and other exx. in S.B. Cf. vi. 38, xii. 20.

εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς] 'the eternal dwellings.' Cf. Enoch xxxix. 4, "And then I saw another vision, the dwelling-places of the holy, and the resting-places of the righteous."

10. Various sayings are appended connected with wealth. We pass here to a quite different thought in relation to the use of wealth: he that is faithful in a small trust, is faithful in a great trust. The idea and the wording recall the parable of the talents, cf. xix. 17 = Mt. xxv. 21. We may conjecture that the saying in this place is intended to guard against a possible misinterpretation of the parable of the unjust steward.

11. If you have not been faithful with mere worldly wealth, who will entrust to you the genuine treasure of heaven? Faithful use of wealth continues to be the chief thought, but we return to the idea of *v.* 9, that wealth is an alien possession. This is more definitely stated in the next verse: ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ . . . τὸ ἡμέτερον. W.H. follow B in reading ἡμέτερον. The meaning is not essentially different from the strongly attested ὑμέτερον: 'that which is truly man's.' But ἡμέτερον is awkward followed by ὑμῖν. If we read ἡμέτερον we must suppose that Jesus sets himself along with other heirs of the kingdom.

13. Yet another thought on wealth. Devotion to mammon is not com-

γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ ἑνὸς
ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει. οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ
14 δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ. Ἤκουον δὲ ταῦτα πάντα
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες, καὶ ἐξεμυκτήριζον
15 αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ δικαιοῦντες
ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ δὲ θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς
καρδίας ὑμῶν· ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλὸν βδέλυγμα ἐνώ-
16 πιον τοῦ θεοῦ. Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάνου·
ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται καὶ πᾶς εἰς

patible with devotion to God. The saying is identical with that in Mt. vi. 24 except that Lk. has added οἰκέτης to explain οὐδείς.

14. φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες] "Money-making generally agrees well with religious separatism, both among Jews and Christians" (Wellh.). The connexion of the sayings which follow (*vv.* 14-18) with what precedes and with one another is obscure. The arrangement is probably editorial.

15. We may perhaps supply an unexpressed concession: "You do indeed give alms, but you only do so to justify yourselves before men" (cf. Mt. vi., where, in accordance with Jewish usage, δικαιοσύνη consists of fasting, almsgiving, and prayer). The thought continues: "God knows your covetous hearts, and your good report among men increases your condemnation before God."

16-18. We now leave the particular topic of covetousness, and the wider issues of the conflict between Jesus and Pharisaism are touched upon. The old order was in force until John. From his time the kingdom of God is preached and all men enter (*v.* 16). It must not be supposed that this abrogates the law. On the contrary, the entire law stands (*v.* 17). It stands because it has been fulfilled. Moses permitted, and Jesus forbade, divorce. But Jesus, in so doing, brought to light the inner meaning of the ancient law (*v.* 18). Some such connexion may be conjecturally supposed to have been in the evangelist's mind. The topic of divorce is introduced abruptly and leads no further. It is introduced as a striking instance of conflict between the teaching of Jesus and the Jewish law. Therefore it is set side by side with the assertion of the permanence of the law in order to affirm the paradoxical claim that the law is at once ended and in force.

16. The saying clearly has a common origin with Mt. xi. 12-13 ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάνου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν. πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάνου επροφήτευσαν. The meaning of the Matthaean saying is very obscure. Reference may be made to Harnack, *S.B.A.*, 1907, pp. 948 f., who assigns a favourable meaning to βιάζεται, βιασταί: the kingdom belongs by right to those who storm it; and to Dibelius (*Urchr. Überlief. von Johannes d. Täufer*, pp. 24 f.), who interprets of the evil spirits, οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (1 Cor. ii. 6-8), which do violence to the kingdom in this present age. For the more usual—and apparently

*αὐτὴν βιάζεται. Εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἐστιν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ* 17
*τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κερέαν πεσεῖν.*
*Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν* 18

more probable—interpretation, of the Zealots, who urged that the divine assistance should be secured by revolt from Rome (cf. Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 1. 1), see B. T. D. Smith, *ad loc.* From a literary point of view the version given here may be confidently pronounced secondary. Luke prob. felt the obscurity and has given a clear but different meaning to the words: the ancient order endured till John; from his time the kingdom is preached and all men force their way in. Here we have the characteristic Lucan emphasis—entirely absent in Mt. xi. 12—on the universality of the Gospel. *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* is a favourite Lucan word. In Mt. *βιάζεται* is passive, as is shewn by *βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν*, 'the kingdom suffers violence.' Here *βιάζεται* is middle. In Mt. the verb *ἐπροφήτευσαν* is perhaps intended to leave open the present validity of the law. After John the law no longer 'prophesied,' but it was not therefore necessarily abrogated as law. The Lucan version makes the breach inaugurated by John explicit.

17. The saying is also found in a somewhat longer form in Mt. v. 18. *μία κερέα*] Usually interpreted of the marks which distinguish the letters ד from ר, ח from ה, ב from כ. Cf. Orig. *Select. in Psalm.* (Lommatsch, xi. p. 363) *τοῦ χὰφ καὶ τοῦ βὴθ πολλὴν ὁμοιότητα σωζόντων, ὡς κατὰ μηδὲν ἀλλήλων διαλλάττειν ἢ βραχείᾳ κεραίᾳ μόνῃ.* But acc. to S.B. (i. p. 248) the *κερέα* is an ornamental stroke added to single letters of the alphabet.

The attitude of a great personality to the institutions among which he lives may often appear equivocal to outsiders, and be capable of differing interpretations by his followers. This saying merely repeats the fundamental dogma of Judaism that the Mosaic law, in all its parts, is eternal. Cf. Bar. iv. 1; Tob. i. 6; 4 Esdr. ix. 37; Philo, *Vita Mos.* ii. 14 f. p. 136 *τὰ δὲ τούτου μόνου βέβαια, ἀσάλευτα, ἀκράδαντα, καθάπερ σφραγῖσι φύσεως αὐτῆς σεσημασμένα, μένει παγίως ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἡμέρας ἐγράφη μέχρι νῦν καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἔπειτα πάντα διαμενεῖν ἐλπὶς αὐτὰ αἰῶνα ὥσπερ ἀθάνατα, ἕως ἂν ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ὁ σύμπας οὐρανός τε καὶ κόσμος ᾖ.*

In view of other passages in the Gospels (e.g. the stories dealing with Sabbath observance, or the saying on divorce which here follows) it is hard to think that Jesus would have expressed himself in these words. Yet it is at any rate certain that it must have been plausible for many of the early believers to suppose that he had done so, and that is highly significant. Jesus criticised the law at particular points, but the question of the validity of the law as a whole did not arise before the Gentile Mission. Faced by that challenge the Judaizing Christians would be strengthened by the belief that the Master had spoken thus. The saying attributed to Jesus retained its place in the tradition, even when the issue over the law was no longer alive. For *τοῦ νόμου* Marcion substituted *τῶν λόγων μου.* Cf. xxi. 33.

18. In Jewish law the man alone has power to divorce. In Mk. x. 12 the case of a woman divorcing her husband is considered. This case could not arise in ordinary Jewish society. Here and in Mt. v. 32 divorce by the man is alone con-

*μοιχεύει, καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.*

sidered. A man who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery. The divorce in itself is wrong, but the adultery consists in the second marriage. (The case is the same as that of Mk. x. 11. In Mt. v. 32 the point is made that the man by divorcing his wife makes *her* commit adultery, i.e. if she marry another.) In virtue of the same principle a man who marries a divorced woman commits adultery, for she is really the wife of another man. (This is the same case as Mt. v. 32b.) Divorce is here spoken of without qualification. In Mt. v. 32 and xix. 9 an exceptive clause is introduced: 'except for unchastity.' There can be little doubt that this is an interpretative gloss. Yet though a gloss it seems on the whole probable that it preserves the actual purport of the teaching of Jesus. Under the Mosaic law the woman's adultery was punishable by death (Deut. xxii. 22, cf. Jo. viii. 5). Thus the case of divorce after adultery could not arise. But "it is not probable that the death penalty for adultery was inflicted at all in the age of Jesus. The Jewish courts had lost the general power of capital punishment in the year 30 A.D. (T.J. Sanh. 18a, T.B. 41a). The Mishnah cites a single case which would fall within the age of Jesus, but it does so doubtfully (Sanh. vii. 2), and Josephus's casual assertion that the penalty for adultery was death is rather an antiquarian note than a record of experience (*Apion.* ii. 25)" (Abrahams, *Studies*, i. p. 73). But Jewish feeling did not cease to regard the marriage tie as already broken by the woman's adultery, for the man was *compelled* by the later Jewish law to divorce his wife for proven adultery (cf. Abrahams, *op. cit.* p. 74). The teaching of Jesus as given in Mk. and Lk. is in itself compatible with the view that Jesus challenged this general principle, and asserted, in opposition thereto, that the marriage bond was (as Western canon law holds) in itself indissoluble. But it is perhaps more probable that the case of the woman's adultery is not here considered. Full justice is done to the words of Jesus if we suppose that he is dealing with the legal right possessed by a Jewish husband to divorce his wife 'for any cause.' Cf. Mt. xix. 3; Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 253 *γυναικὸς δὲ τῆς συνοικούσης βουλόμενος διαζευχθῆναι καθ' ἁσδηποτοῦν αἰτίας, πολλαὶ δ' ἂν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοιαῦται γίγνοιντο* . . . For a further discussion see Montefiore (*Synoptic Gospels*) on the Gospel texts.

## THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS (xvi. 19-31)

Another Lucan story. See Introd. to x. 25 f. There are two distinct themes: (1) that compensation for conditions in this life is to follow death; (2) that a miraculous appearance of one risen from the dead would not avail to convert those who are not converted by Moses and the prophets. In the former part of the story the whole emphasis falls upon the contrast in condition between the rich man and Lazarus during their life-time and the corresponding reversal in the next world. The teaching is that of the Lucan Sermon: "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God . . . . Woe to you rich, for ye have your consolation" (vi. 20, 24). It would not be true to say that the moral aspect is left out: the ostentation of the rich man, while the beggar lies outside, suggests a harsh character. Yet this is not emphasised. The words of Abraham to the rich man give the leading thought: "Remember, my son, that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus likewise evil things; but now he is here comforted, and thou art tormented." In the latter part of the parable this theme is dropped. The intention of the latter half of the story is not entirely clear. The moral might have been pointed against the Sadducean position (cf. xx. 27 f.). Moses and the prophets should have been enough to convince them of the world beyond. But there is little to suggest this particular intention. Bultmann, who holds that the second part of the parable is an appendix, argues that it does not move beyond the ordinary Jewish idea that no miracle is necessary to authenticate the Divine teaching already given by Moses and the prophets (cf. Deut. xxx. 11-14). This, however, is not exactly the point of the parable. The purpose for which the rich man desires Lazarus to be sent is not to authenticate God's word already given, but to move his brethren to repent lest they come to Hell. The possibility that the parable echoes Christian reflection upon the Jewish disbelief in the resurrection of Jesus must be allowed. One *had* risen from the dead, and yet the Jews had not believed. The explanation was that they did not rightly believe the revelation which they already possessed. This view is adopted by Loisy, who adds: "The unity of the parable is maintained inasmuch as the rich man and Lazarus already personify Pharisaic Judaism and the mass of the Christians respectively" (p. 419).

The highly coloured picture of life beyond the grave stands alone in the Gospels. The suggestion that some popular story has here been utilised and adapted seems not improbable. In a learned and interesting article ('Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus,' *Abhandlungen d. preuss. Ak. d. Wissensch.*, Berlin, 1918, No. 7) Gressmann adduces striking parallels from Egyptian and Jewish sources which deal with the theme of the fate of the poor just man and the wicked rich in the next world. A demotic papyrus of the first century contains a story which itself probably dates from some centuries earlier, of how the god Horus was born as son to Setne, the son of Rameses II., and his sister-wife Meh-usechet. One day, at Memphis, Setne sees two corpses taken out to burial—one that of a rich man, which is magnificently attired and attended by many mourners, and the other that of a poor man, which is carried out unattended on a humble mat. Setne exclaims how much better the rich fare in the nether-world than the poor. But his Divine son conducts him to the other world, and reveals to him the fortunes of the two men beyond the grave: "Seest thou this notable man, magnificently attired in royal linen, near by Osiris? He is that same poor man whom thou sawest, when he was carried out of Memphis to his grave without attendants, and covered up upon a mat. He was brought to the under-world, and his evil deeds were weighed against his good deeds. . . . Therefore it was ordered by Osiris that the grave clothes of the rich man should be given to the poor man, and that the poor man should be placed among the splendid and transfigured ones." Then the miserable fate of the wealthy and wicked man is also revealed, and the conclusion is drawn that "he who is good on earth, receives good in the underworld, but he who is evil on earth, receives evil" (cf. F. Ll. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, pp. 42 f.). Gressmann holds that this story travelled from Egypt to Palestine, where it was utilised and adapted by the Jews. The parable in the Gospel reproduces a well-known tale, which Jesus has appropriated, appending thereto a new and characteristic conclusion of his own (*vv.* 27-31), in which the true purpose of the parable is to be sought. The story underwent another and independent modification at the hands of Rabbis, who told a similar story of the death and burial of a poor but pious student of the law, and of a wealthy and godless publican. The Jewish version carries through consistently the doctrine of merit and corresponding punishment. Not only is the piety of the poor man rewarded in the next world, and the wickedness of the ungodly rich man punished, but it is revealed that the transient prosperity of the wicked man on earth was a reward for some slight good deed which he had performed, while the earthly misfortunes of the pious man were likewise due to a temporary lapse from the right way. The story appears in seven different versions, the earliest of which appears to be that in the Palestinian Talmud *Chagiga*, ii. p. 77 d. Gressmann further argues, following Harnack (*T. u. U.* xiii. i., 1895, pp. 75 f.; *Th. Lit. Zeit.* 1895, p. 428), that the names assigned to the rich man in Christian sources of the third century were borrowed from Jewish versions of the tale, and that the Jewish versions were recognised by Christian writers as in essence identical with the Christian parable. But the evidence here is far from conclusive. In the extant Hebrew versions the poor man has no name, and Gressmann's attempt to derive the names assigned to the rich man in Christian writers from the name given in Jewish sources depends upon too many conjectural corruptions to carry much weight. See *v.* 19 n.

Ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος, καὶ ἐνεδιδύσκετο 19
πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον εὐφραινόμενος καθ' ἡμέραν λαμ-
πρῶς. πτωχὸς δέ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος ἐβέβλητο πρὸς 20
τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ εἱλκωμένος καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτα- 21
σθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλου-
σίου· ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἕλκη

21 πλουσιου] add και ουδεις εδιδου αυτω (ex Lk xv. 16) 69 etc l m Aphr

19 f. Jesus is to be thought of as still addressing the covetous Pharisees, cf. v. 15. He addresses himself again to the disciples at xvii. 1.

19-20. ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος . . . πτωχὸς δέ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος] This is the only case in which a proper name is assigned to a character in a Gospel parable. The coincidence of the name with that of the brother of Martha and Mary in Jo. xi. is noteworthy. Already in the third century Origen found it necessary to combat the view that the Lazarus of the parable was identical with the Lazarus of Jo. xi. (*In Joann.* fragm. 77, ed. Brooke, ii. p. 286). The name was common, but in view of *vv.* 30, 31 (cf. Jo. xii. 10) it is hard to escape the suspicion that the identity of name is not accidental. J. Weiss suggests that *either* the name Lazarus was introduced into the text here under the influence of Jo. xi. at the time of the formation of the Canon, *or* the story of the raising of Lazarus was already in circulation at the time of the composition of the Gospel, and that the conclusion of the parable may have been composed and added and the name Lazarus incorporated under the influence of that story. The former alternative seems most unlikely. The dialogue in *vv.* 23 f. between Abraham and the rich man makes it indispensable that the poor man should have a proper name by which the rich man can refer to him; cf. esp. *v.* 24 πέμψον Λάζαρον. The latter suggestion is attractive. Another possibility is that Jo. xi. is itself influenced by the conclusion of this parable.

By the third century names were provided for the rich man also. The Sahidic version names him Nineve. In pseudo-Cyprian *De pascha computus* (A.D. 242-243) he is called Finaeus. This is, no doubt, the same as Phinees, the name given in Priscillian, Tract ix. Gressmann conjectures that both Nineve (Νιναῖος) and Phinees (Φιναῖος) are independent corruptions of Μιναῖος, a conjectural Greek equivalent for בריה דמעין, the name of the rich publican in the Jewish story of Pal. Talm. *Chagiga*, 77 d. This seems precarious. M. R. James, *J.Th.S.* vii. (1906), pp. 564 f., quotes a marginal note from a versified Bible of Peter of Riga (end of 12th cent.) which names the rich man Amonofis.

19. πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον] A purple garment would be worn over linen undergarments. For the combination cf. Rev. xviii. 12, Prov. xxix. 40 (xxxi. 22). βύσσος — a Semitic loan-word (בוּץ) long naturalised in Greek. On the material and its manufacture in Egypt see reff. s.v. βύσσινος in M.M.

21. ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι] Cf. xv. 16. ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες κτλ.] We must probably take this as an aggravation of the poor man's distress, not as an alleviating circum-

22 αὐτοῦ. ἐγένετο δὲ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πτωχὸν καὶ ἀπενεχθῆναι
αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ· ἀπ-
23 έθανεν δὲ καὶ ὁ πλούσιος καὶ ἐτάφη. καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ
ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὑπάρχων ἐν βασάνοις, ὁρᾷ
Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν καὶ Λάζαρον ἐν τοῖς κόλποις

22-23 εταφη. και εν τω αδη επαρας b f: om και ℵ* q ff$^{2}$ vid aeth: sepultus est aput inferos et de inferno elevans a: sepultus est in inferno. [e]levans autem (m et elevans) c e l m vg: was buried and? cast? in Sheol he lifted up syr.sin

stance (as though the dogs shewed a kindness which men refused). The poor man is unable to fend off the vagrant dogs. To an oriental the dog is an unclean animal.

22. ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων] That the soul is carried away at death by supernatural beings is a widespread idea. For the rabbinic doctrine (first attested by R. Meir c. A.D. 150) of 'the angels of service' and 'the angels of destruction,' who encounter the souls of the righteous and of the godless respectively at death, see S.B. *ad loc.* The conception here is that at death the departed go at once to their appropriate place. Without awaiting a 'last judgement,' the righteous are taken to join the patriarchs in heaven or Paradise, and the unrighteous are surrendered to torment in Hades; cf. xxiii. 43. Nothing here leads us to suppose that an 'intermediate state' is being pictured. According to S.B. (ii. p. 227) there is in the old Jewish literature no trace of the use of the term 'Abraham's bosom' to describe that part of Sheol or Hades set apart for the righteous, nor is the Garden of Eden or Paradise ever located in Sheol. 'To lie in Abraham's bosom' plainly means to enjoy close fellowship with the patriarch, but whether the metaphor is drawn from the relation of parent and child (cf. Jo. i. 18) or from the proximity of fellow-banqueters (cf. Jo. xiii. 23 and *supra*, xiii. 29) is uncertain. The former seems more congruous. The phrase occurs once in the Talmud (T. B. Qiddushin, 72 b), but its meaning there is doubtful. Cf. Abraham's *Studies*, ii. p. 203. For the idea that the patriarchs receive the faithful departed cf. 4 Macc. xiii. 17 οὕτως παθόντας ἡμᾶς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ὑποδέξονται.

καὶ ἐτάφη] Not a superfluous addition. No token of the divine judgement—and failure to receive burial would be accounted such—was manifested on earth. Cf. S.B. *ad loc.*

23. ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ] i.e. Sheol, the place of the departed. Properly distinct from Gehenna, the place of torment to which the wicked are committed after judgement. But when the idea of judgement at death becomes prevalent, as in the Jewish Hellenistic world of thought, the conception of Sheol or Hades is modified. In Enoch xxii. there are adjoining quarters of torment and blessedness in Sheol for the evil and the good *until the judgement*. Elsewhere in Enoch (xxxix.) the dwellings of the righteous are in heaven. The 'geography' is equally vague in this passage. S.B. (Excursus *Scheol*, iv. p. 1019) wish to keep the usual N.T. meaning of ᾅδης in this passage as the place of the departed and think that both Lazarus and the rich man are in Hades or Sheol,

αὐτοῦ. καὶ αὐτὸς φωνήσας εἶπεν Πάτερ Ἀβραάμ, ἐλέησόν 24
με καὶ πέμψον Λάζαρον ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ
δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος καὶ καταψύξῃ τὴν γλῶσσάν μου,
ὅτι ὀδυνῶμαι ἐν τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ. εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ Τέκνον, 25
μνήσθητι ὅτι ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθά σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ
σου, καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακά· νῦν δὲ ὧδε παρακαλεῖται
σὺ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσαι. καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις μεταξὺ ἡμῶν 26
καὶ ὑμῶν χάσμα μέγα ἐστήρικται, ὅπως οἱ θέλοντες διαβῆναι
ἔνθεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς μὴ δύνωνται, μηδὲ ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς
ἡμᾶς διαπερῶσιν. εἶπεν δέ Ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν, πάτερ, ἵνα 27
πέμψῃς αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου, ἔχω γὰρ 28
πέντε ἀδελφούς, ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ καὶ

25 ωδε codd et verss paene omn: οδε 1 etc Diat (ut vid cf Burkitt *Ev. da Meph.* vol. ii. p. 136) ς: in verss latt hic et ωδε et οδε reddere potest

but separated from one another by the 'great chasm.' So also Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*$^3$ pp. 293 f. But this verse seems rather to favour the view that the rich man alone is ἐν ᾅδῃ. If so, Hades is here used almost as equivalent to Gehenna (for this usage cf. S.B. iv. p. 1017), and this view seems to be supported by the observation of S.B. that the term 'Abraham's bosom' is not used of a part of Sheol in Jewish literature. Cf. *v.* 22 n.

24. Πάτερ Ἀβραάμ] Abraham is, and remains, the father of them both. Cf. Τέκνον *v.* 25.

ὕδατος] In En. xxii. 9 f. there is a spring of water in the dwellings of the righteous dead. Cf. also *Chagiga* 77 d, where the poor but pious student of the law is seen in a dream by his fellow, wandering at his ease in gardens and by springs of water, while the godless man (like Tantalus) stretches out his tongue from the bank at a stream of water which he is unable to reach.

26. The request of the rich man not only ought not, but cannot be granted. This verse affords the transition to the second part of the parable. If Lazarus cannot come to the rich man in Hades, at least let him be sent to the rich man's brethren on earth, that they may repent while there is yet time.

ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις] In all this condition of things there is a further point. The reading ἐπί (AD, etc.) for ἐν (אB al) is easier and no doubt secondary, but it must give the right sense: 'in addition to all this.' It is too bald to translate, with Lagrange, 'in all these regions.'

χάσμα μέγα] This does not appear to be a usual feature in Jewish eschatological conceptions. The χάσματα in Plato, *Rep.* x. 614 (Myth of Er) are the two ways by which the souls depart after judgement, and provide no parallel to this passage.

27. Cf. *Rep.* x. 614 D εἰπεῖν ὅτι δέοι αὐτὸν ἄγγελον ἀνθρώποις γενέσθαι τῶν ἐκεῖ καὶ διακελεύοιντό οἱ ἀκούειν τε καὶ θεᾶσθαι πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. Lucian, *Demon.* 43 ἐρομένου δέ τινος Ποῖα νομίζεις εἶναι τὰ ἐν ᾅδου; περίμεινον, ἔφη, κἀκεῖθέν σοι ἐπιστελῶ.

29 αὐτοὶ ἔλθωσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς βασάνου. λέγει
δὲ Ἀβραάμ Ἔχουσι Μωυσέα καὶ τοὺς προφήτας· ἀκου-
30 σάτωσαν αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Οὐχί, πάτερ Ἀβραάμ, ἀλλ'
ἐάν τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν πορευθῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετανοήσουσιν.
31 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Εἰ Μωυσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ
ἀκούουσιν, οὐδ' ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ πεισθήσονται.

XVII. 1 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ Ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν
τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἐλθεῖν, πλὴν οὐαὶ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται·
2 λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος μυλικὸς περίκειται περὶ τὸν τρά-
χηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ ἵνα σκαν-

31 *αναστη*] *απελθη* (vel simile) syr.sin lat.vt : *αναστη και απελθη* D Iren

31. The reading of syr.sin and lat.vt (preferred by Blass and Merx) may be ascribed to the influence of *πορευθῇ* above. If, as is probable, *ἀναστῇ* be the original reading, the resurrection of Jesus (or of Lazarus? cf. Jo. xi.) and the subsequent unbelief of the Jews can hardly have been absent from the mind of the evangelist. Cf. *vv.* 19, 20 n.

1-10. Four disconnected sayings. There appears to be no unity of thought. Parallels to the first three occur in Matthew in fairly close proximity. The arrangement, therefore, may go back to Luke's source.

1-2. *On Scandals.* There is a parallel to this saying in Mt. xviii. 6-7, where, however, the two clauses occur in inverse order. There is also a parallel to *v.* 2 in Mk. ix. 43 (omitted, with the rest of this section, in Lk.). Mt. has perhaps conflated Q and Mk. (Mk. *ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων*: so Mt. + *εἰς ἐμέ*), and Lk. may preserve the form of Q, though verbal alterations are probable. Another version of the saying is quoted in Clem. *ad Cor.* xlvi. (with *τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου* for *τῶν μικρῶν τούτων*).

1. *ἀνένδεκτον*] Here only in N.T. and rare elsewhere, but cf. xiii. 33 *οὐκ ἐνδέχεται*, 'it is not possible'—likewise *ἅπ. λεγ.*

*τὰ σκάνδαλα*] *σκάνδαλον* not infreq. in LXX as equivalent for מוֹקֵשׁ a 'bait,' or 'lure,' and then fig. 'snare.' So also in class. Gk. *σκανδάληθρον* means 'the spring of a trap.' The idea of a snare or lure by which a man is liable to be entrapped into sin is perhaps the dominant idea connoted by the word in the N.T. rather than 'stumbling-block.' Cf. M.M. and P.B. *s.v.*

2. *λυσιτελεῖ*] Good classical Greek. LXX. Here only in N.T.

*λίθος μυλικός*] Prob. Lk.'s correction for the more picturesque *μύλος ὀνικός* (Mt. and Mk.). On the meaning of the latter term (a mill-stone turned by an ass) see Lagrange, p. 551.

Jesus propounds no theory of the origin of evil. Its existence is recognised and its necessity affirmed, but this recognition is coupled with a 'woe' upon the man through whom temptation shall come even to the least and humblest. The addition in Mk. Mt. *τῶν πιστευόντων* [*εἰς ἐμέ* Mt.] applies the saying to the life of the Christian community.

δαλίσῃ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα. προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. ἐὰν 3
ἁμάρτῃ ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐὰν μετα-
νοήσῃ ἄφες αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐὰν ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς 4
σὲ καὶ ἑπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ λέγων Μετανοῶ, ἀφ-
ήσεις αὐτῷ. Καὶ εἶπαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ κυρίῳ 5
Πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος Εἰ ἔχετε πίστιν 6
ὡς κοκκον σινάπεως, ἐλέγετε ἂν τῇ συκαμίνῳ [ταύτῃ]
Ἐκριζώθητι καὶ φυτεύθητι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· καὶ ὑπήκουσεν
ἂν ὑμῖν. Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλον ἔχων ἀρο- 7
τριῶντα ἢ ποιμαίνοντα, ὃς εἰσελθόντι ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ

6 *ταυτη* om ℵDL

3-4. *On Forgiveness.* προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς] This phrase is frequent in Lk. (xii. 1, xxi. 34; Ac. v. 35, xx. 28) and peculiar to the Lucan writings in N.T. It is perhaps introduced here to make a connexion with the preceding saying: Take heed how you treat others, take heed also to yourselves. Parallels to *vv.* 3-4 in Mt. xviii. 15, 21-22. Mt. appears to have expanded the former part of this saying into a rule of Church discipline. Here it is offences against the individual which are in question throughout. Mt. does not give the injunction to forgive until *vv.* 21-22. Peter's question in Mt. *v.* 21 may be editorial. Lk.'s version of the saying lays emphasis upon the repentance of the sinner. This is not the point in Mt. *vv.* 21-22. Mt. may be the more original here. Cf. Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 94.

5-6. *On Faith.* Verse 5 is an editorial introduction. Note the use of ἀπόστολοι and ὁ κύριος.

πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν] 'bestow upon us more faith,' or perhaps better, 'give us also faith.'

6. εἰ ἔχετε] A present unfulfilled condition should have the imperfect in the protasis. εἴχετε (D al) is no doubt a correction.

Parallels to this saying are found in Mt. xvii. 20 b (appended to the Marcan narrative of the healing of the lunatic boy) and Mk. xi. 23 (=Mt. xxi. 21-22); cf. also 1 Cor. xiii. 2. The sycamine tree (in place of the mountain) is peculiar to Lk. 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed' is common to Mt. xvii. and Lk. (not in Mk.); 'cast into the sea' is common to Lk. and Mk. xi. (=Mt. xxi.) (Mt. xvii. μετάβα ἔνθεν ἐκεῖ). Here, therefore, Lk. appears to be dependent both upon Q (Mt. xvii.) and Mk. xi. It is a probable conjecture that the συκάμινος—far less congruous as a metaphor than the mountain—is due to a recollection of the incident of the συκῆ which Lk. has omitted from Mk. xi. Cf. Mt. xxi. 21 οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς ποιήσετε, ἀλλὰ κἂν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ εἴπητε κτλ.

7-10. *The disciple a servant of God.* Peculiar to Luke. There appears to be no connexion with what precedes. The conditions of a slave's life are portrayed without comment or criticism. The slave works all day in the field, and does not expect to be waited on when he returns. On the contrary, he must first prepare his master's dinner and wait upon him, before he eats and drinks himself. Nor does the master feel him-

8 *Εὐθέως παρελθὼν ἀνάπεσε, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ Ἑτοίμα-
σον τί δειπνήσω, καὶ περιζωσάμενος διακόνει μοι ἕως
φάγω καὶ πίω, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα φάγεσαι καὶ πίεσαι σύ;*
9 *μὴ ἔχει χάριν τῷ δούλῳ ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὰ διαταχθέντα;*
10 *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ποιήσητε πάντα τὰ διαταχθέντα
ὑμῖν, λέγετε ὅτι Δοῦλοι ἀχρεῖοί ἐσμεν, ὃ ὠφείλομεν
ποιῆσαι πεποιήκαμεν.*

9 add *ου δοκω* AD al pler latt syr.vg ς: om ℵBLX 1 etc 157 a e syr.vt arm aegg aeth Cypr 10 *αχρειοι* om syr.sin

self under any obligation to his servant for his services. So is the relation of the disciple to God. When we have fulfilled all our duties, we still have no claim on God. What God bestows is the gift of his goodness, not requital for service rendered. Montefiore rightly emphasises that Jesus—as well as the Rabbis—was not afraid to speak of man's relation to God as that of slave and master. Both Jesus and the Rabbis from different points of view, and in different moods, taught both that God was man's Father, and that man was God's slave. "Neither is false." Montefiore continues: "It is most notable that man can claim no reward from God. That was not quite original teaching, but it was so relatively. The tilt against exaggerations and perversions of the doctrine of tit for tat is a prominent and characteristic feature of the teaching of Jesus. What we receive from God is grace and goodness and not reward. There is no doubt that the *excessive* emphasis and elaboration of the doctrine of retribution was one of the weak spots in Rabbinic Judaism" (*Synoptic Gospels,* vol. ii. p. 543).

The meaning of the parable is somewhat obscured by the adjective *ἀχρεῖοι* in *v.* 10, if it is interpreted 'unprofitable' as in Mt. xxv. 30. The emphasis must not fall on the quality of the service rendered, but on the circumstance that those who have done all are, at the end, servants and no more. Syr.sin omits the adjective, and this is preferred by Wellh. and J. Weiss. But *ἀχρεῖον* may mean 'poor,' 'unworthy,' rather than 'useless'; cf. 2 Regn. vi. 22. Thus interpreted the adjective helps to bring out the sense of the passage.

## THE HEALING OF TEN LEPERS (xvii. 11-19)

Peculiar to Luke. There are striking resemblances to the healing of the leper in Mk. i. 40 f., but ten lepers, not one, are healed, the healing itself is more marvellous, the command to the lepers to shew themselves to the priests plays a different part in the story, and the whole narrative leads up to the gratitude of the one alien and the ingratitude of the other nine. We may suppose that we are here given an ideal scene, founded upon the story in Mark, which has taken shape in a Gentile Church: Jesus is shown as the beneficent healer who lavishes his goodness upon all who need, and receives thankful homage from the alien. We ought not, therefore, to ask whether the ungrateful nine were, or were not, saved by faith (see *v.* 19).

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ 11
αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας. Καὶ 12
εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ εἴς τινα κώμην ἀπήντησαν δέκα
λεπροὶ ἄνδρες, οἳ ἀνέστησαν πόρρωθεν· καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦραν 13
φωνὴν λέγοντες Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστάτα, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. καὶ ἰδὼν 14
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖϲ ἱερεῦϲιν.
καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοὺς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. εἷς δὲ 15
ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη, ὑπέστρεψεν μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης
δοξάζων τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον παρὰ τοὺς 16
πόδας αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Σαμαρείτης.
ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Οὐχ οἱ δέκα ἐκαθαρί- 17
σθησαν; οἱ [δὲ] ἐννέα ποῦ; οὐχ εὑρέθησαν ὑποστρέψαντες 18
δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος; καὶ εἶπεν 19
αὐτῷ Ἀναστὰς πορεύου· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

11 *δια μεσον*] *μεσον* D 1 etc 69 etc   *Γαλιλαιας*] add et Hiericho lat.vt syr.cur: 28 habet *διηρχετο την Ιεριχω και δια μεσον κτλ.*   17 *ουχ οι*] *ουτοι* D lat.vt syr.vt: *ουχι οι δεκα ουτοι* ΛΠ al pauc arm sah

11. We are again (cf. xiii. 22) abruptly reminded that Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem. The mention of Samaria explains how a Samaritan comes to be included in the group of lepers in the story that follows. *διὰ μέσον* (corrected into *διὰ μέσου* in A and most MSS.) is difficult. The poetical constr. of *διά* c. accus. of place is found here only in N.T., but is not unknown in later Gk. prose. Cf. P.B. s.v. *διά*. Perhaps we should read *μέσον* alone with D and important supporters. The meaning can hardly be 'through the middle of Samaria and Galilee' if Jesus was on the way to Jerusalem. It is better to translate 'between Samaria and Galilee,' i.e. along the borders of S. and G.

13. *πόρρωθεν*] In order to conform to the law. Cf. Lev. xiii. 45, 46; Num. v. 2.

*ἐπιστάτα*] The Lucan substitute for Ῥαββεί or *διδάσκαλε*. Cf. v. 5, viii. 24, 45, ix. 33, 49.

14. *ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν*] Cf. Lev. xiii. 49 f.

## Concerning the Coming of the Kingdom of God and the Revelation of the Son of Man (xvii. 20-37)

A great part of the sayings in this paragraph (*vv.* 23-24, 26-27, 34-37) are found also in Mt. xxiv., and may be presumed to come from Q. Matthew has combined a collection of apocalyptic sayings in Q with the apocalyptic discourse of Mk. xiii. Luke also reproduces the two sources, but keeps them distinct (see *c.* xxi.). This paragraph also contains material peculiar to this Gospel, particularly the answer to the questions of the Pharisees (*vv.* 20-21), the comparison of the revelation of the Son of Man to the overthrow of Sodom (*vv.* 28-30, 32), as well as a warning parallel to Mk. xiii. 15-16 (*v.* 31), and another saying (*v.* 33) which occurs in a different non-Marcan context in Matthew.

It seems, however, probable that Luke has to some extent edited the source. Verse 31 has probably been introduced from Mk. xiii. It requires a somewhat forced interpretation in its present context, and the same applies to the (Q) saying which follows. The doubts and problems to which the expectation of the Parousia gave rise in the second generation of believers seem to be reflected in Luke's recasting of his material. The belief in the future coming of the Son of Man maintains its ground, but the evangelist shews that disappointments are to be expected (*v.* 22), and the questions When ? and Where ? cannot be directly answered. The expected return of Jesus should be prepared for by the renunciation of worldly goods. Only so may men win their life in the world to come.

20 *Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ*
*βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Οὐκ ἔρχε-*
21 *ται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, οὐδὲ ἐροῦ-*
*σιν Ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἤ Ἐκεῖ· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*

20. *ἐπερωτηθεὶς δέ κτλ.*] The structure of the introductory sentence is typically Greek (see Bultmann, p. 12). Cf. 2 Clem. xii. 2 *ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπό τινος, πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, κτλ.*

*μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*] The meaning is that it is useless to watch for signs which may shew when the Kingdom is about to come. The noun is found here only in N.T. and is rare elsewhere. The verb is found in the sense of 'to spy upon,' 'to watch,' also 'to observe' days as a religious ordinance (Gal. iv. 10), but not in the exact sense required here for *παρατήρησις.*

21. *οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν Ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἤ Ἐκεῖ*] The meaning is that 'Lo here!' or 'Lo there!' cannot be rightly said of the true coming of the Kingdom. Obviously it does not deny that 'Lo here!' or 'Lo there!' may be said by unauthorised prophets. There is, therefore, no contradiction of *v.* 23.

*ἡ β. τ. θ. ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν*] This has been diversely interpreted both in ancient and in modern times. The obvious translation of *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* is 'within you,' 'in your hearts.' (So, among the ancients, Greg. Nyss., who interprets of the image of God bestowed upon all men at birth, *De Virg.* xii.) Cf. Ps. xxxviii. (xxxix.) 4, cviii. (cix.) 22, cii. (ciii.) 1; Is. xvi. 11. This rendering of *ἐντός* (adopted by Wellh. among ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν. Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς 22

others) yields a good meaning. An unhealthy preoccupation with questions as to the time and place of the coming of the end is countered by a doctrine of the Kingdom as a spiritual and inward reality of which it is not possible to say 'Lo here!' and 'Lo there!'

It is objected to this interpretation of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν (1) that the words are then inappropriate as addressed to the Pharisees, and (2) that this conception of the Kingdom as an inward and invisible power in the hearts of men is without parallel in the Gospels. The dominant conception in the Gospels is that of an approaching reign of God embodied in a world-embracing order, into which men may 'enter,' or from which they may be excluded. Or, again, it is a gift which God will bestow upon his elect (cf. xii. 32). It does not seem doubtful that the primary meaning of 'the Kingdom of God' in the teaching of Jesus is eschatological. The Kingdom is nowhere else used to express an inner condition of the soul. An inner condition of the soul may qualify for admission to the Kingdom, but it is not itself the Kingdom. These objections may be met by translating ἐντὸς ὑμῶν 'among you.' So syr.sin. ἐντός is used in this sense in Xen. *Anab.* i. 10. 3, *Hellen.* ii. 3. 19. The sentence may then be interpreted *either* (as by J. Weiss) that the Kingdom which is hereafter to be manifested is already at work among you (cf. xi. 20 = Mt. xii. 28 ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἡ β. τ. θ.), *or* the present ἐστι may be treated as a prophetic present: 'The Kingdom, when it comes, will suddenly be in your midst.' The meaning is on this last view essentially the same as that of *v.* 24 *infra.*

Either of these interpretations, based on the trans. of ἐντός 'among,' is more easily harmonised with the general usage of the Gospels than the interpretation 'within you,' and it must be recognised that it is precarious to use this text as a key to the meaning of the Kingdom of God in the mind of Jesus. But this does not settle the question as to how Luke understood what he wrote. 'Within' is certainly a possible and probably the most natural interpretation of ἐντός for a Greek. It is undoubtedly awkward on this interpretation that the saying is addressed to the Pharisees, but this objection is not decisive, for the meaning might be 'in the hearts of men.' By the time that Luke's Gospel was written the term 'the Kingdom of God' had lost its earlier definition, and could be used with the new context and associations which the teaching, death, and resurrection of Jesus had imparted to the term (cf. Ac. i. 3, xxviii. 31). The Spirit—the first instalment of the inheritance—was already bestowed, and St. Paul could write to the Romans (xiv. 17) οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ β. τ. θ. βρῶσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Whatever actual saying of Jesus may lie behind these words, it may be that Luke believed that Jesus set the spiritual presence of the Kingdom in men's hearts in antithesis to the expectation of its appearance 'here' or 'there.' But even if this is so, the eschatological conception is by no means superseded in the mind of the evangelist, or eliminated from his Gospel. Cf. Introd. p. lxxii.

22. Further teaching on the coming of the Kingdom or the revelation of the Son of Man is addressed to the disciples.

Ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ
23 υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰδεῖν καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε. καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν
Ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ἤ Ἰδοὺ ὧδε· μὴ [ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ] διώξητε.
24 ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ᾽ οὐρανὸν λάμπει, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
25 ἀνθρώπου. πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀπο-
26 δοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. καὶ καθὼς ἐγένετο
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ
27 υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἐγάμουν, ἐγαμίζοντο,
ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰϲῆλθεν Νῶε εἰϲ τὴν κιβωτόν, καὶ ἦλθεν
28 ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἀπώλεσεν πάντας. ὁμοίως καθὼς
ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ· ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἠγόραζον,
29 ἐπώλουν, ἐφύτευον, ᾠκοδόμουν· ᾗ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἐξῆλθεν Λὼτ
ἀπὸ Σοδόμων, ἔβρεξεν πῦρ καὶ θεῖον ἀπ᾽ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀπ-

23 *απελθητε μηδε* om B 69-13 al pauc arm 24 add *εν τη ημερα αυτου* codd paene omn: om BD 220 lat.vt sah

*μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τ. υἱοῦ τ. ἀ.*] i.e. one of the days of the new age after the Son of Man has been revealed. The verse is peculiar to Lk. and perhaps originates with him. *ἐπιθυμεῖν* four times in the Gospel in passages peculiar to Lk. and once in Acts. Christ anticipates the longings which the evangelist and his readers knew well.

23-24 = Mt. xxiv. 26-27, where the sayings are followed by the equivalent of *v.* 37 *infra*. The appearance of the Son of Man will be sudden and visible to all, like a flash of lightning. There will therefore be no need to look 'here' and 'there.'

24. *οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ.*] Mt. *οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τ. υἱοῦ τ. ἀ.* Neither here nor elsewhere does Lk. use *παρουσία* of the 'second coming.' Perhaps it was not a natural word for those who were learning to look back to a 'coming,' which had already taken place, as well as forward to a 'second coming.' The later use of *παρουσία* for the Incarnation, 'the first coming' (Ign. *Philadelph.* ix. 2), is not found in the N.T. writings.

25. Peculiar to Luke. The former verse need not imply the identity of the speaker with the Son of Man, cf. xii. 8 n. This verse, however, implies the Christian doctrine of the Son of Man. Jesus must first be crucified and rejected before he can appear as Son of Man from heaven.

26-27 = Mt. xxiv. 37-39. As the flood overwhelmed all the unthinking and careless world, except Noah, who was prepared, so will the appearance of the Son of Man overwhelm all who are unprepared for that event.

28-32. Another historical counterpart to the future appearance. Peculiar to Luke. If it was contained in Q, its omission by Mt. is remarkable. Noah and Lot are grouped together in 2 Pet. ii. 5 f., as well as in Rabbinical texts. The history of Lot affords another warn-

ὤλεσεν πάντας. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἔσται ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ 30
ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὃς ἔσται 31
ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μὴ
καταβάτω ἆραι αὐτά, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἀγρῷ ὁμοίως μὴ ἐπιϲτρεψάτω
εἰϲ τὰ ὀπίϲω. μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ. ὃς ἐὰν 32 33
ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν,
ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει ζωογονήσει αὐτήν. λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτῃ 34
τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης [μιᾶς], ὁ εἷς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται· ἔσονται δύο ἀλήθουσαι 35
ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἡ μία παραλημφθήσεται ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα ἀφ- 36
εθήσεται. καὶ ἀποκριθέντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Ποῦ, κύριε; 37
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὅπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ
ἐπισυναχθήσονται.

34 *μιας* om B c 35 om vers ℵ* al aliq l vg (cod D) post 35 add *δυο* [*εσονται*] *εν* [*τω*] *αγρω* [*ο*] *εις παραληφθησεται και ο ετερος αφεθησεται* DU 700 al latt syrr arm (ex Matt xxiv. 40)

ing especially appropriate to the elect Christians, for one of the company that had been saved from the overthrow of Sodom—Lot's wife—turned back and became a pillar of salt. In that day, therefore, let no man turn back to his house or his land.

Verse 31 is parallel to Mk. xiii. 15-16, where, however, the warning is not addressed, as here, to the disciples in general, but to the inhabitants of Palestine, when they see 'the abomination of desolation.' The parallel in Mk. disappears below at xxi. 21. The next verse probably indicates that the sayings here are not to be understood literally, but of the renunciation of earthly possessions.

33. He who seeks to provide for the needs of this life will forfeit his soul; he who surrenders his life here will save it hereafter. There is no parallel in Mt. xxiv., and the placing of the saying here seems secondary. The saying is prob. taken from Q, cf. Mt. x. 39. *περιποιήσασθαι* and *ζωογονεῖν*, both found here only in Gospels, both used in LXX to translate causative forms of חיה, are equivalents for *σώζειν*, 'to preserve alive' (cf. ix. 24). *ζωογονεῖν* is a literal translation of *achi*, the Aramaic word for *σώζειν* (Wellh.). D gives *ζωογονεῖν* and syr.sin *achi* in both clauses.

34-35 = Mt. xxiv. 40-41. But in Mt. we have 'two in a field,' instead of 'two in a bed.' D lat.vt and later texts have supplied the 'two in a field' here from Mt.

37. This saying in Mt. follows the equivalent of *vv.* 23-24 *supra.* It has perhaps been transposed by Lk. to make a conclusion to the paragraph, and the question also has perhaps been supplied by him. The judgement will operate wherever it is called for. It will, therefore, be neither 'here' nor 'there.' Thus the section ends on the same note with which it started.

## Two Parables on Prayer (xviii. 1-14)

The two parables which follow, though very different in tone and character, are both concerned with prayer, and are no doubt placed together for that reason. To each the evangelist has prefixed a slight introduction to explain the purport of the parable. For a similar preface to a parable cf. xix. 11 *infra*. In the case of the former parable, the introduction does not entirely tally with the content of the parable, which is not concerned, as the introduction suggests, with prayer in general, but with the specific prayer that God will speedily avenge his elect. It is possible that the evangelist in reproducing his source was unwilling to emphasise a moral which might be regarded as vindictive in temper. It is held, however, by Jülicher (followed by Bultmann, p. 108) that the parable was not originally concerned with the specific moral which is drawn from it in *vv.* 6-7, but merely enforced the need for persistence in prayer like the very similar parable in xi. 5 f. (cf. Jülicher's views on the parable of the Unjust Steward, *supra* c. xvi.). The similarity in structure and idea between xi. 5 f. and this parable points to some close connexion. But the relation is not easy to determine. The idea of ἐκδίκησις is so closely interwoven in the texture of this story that if the eschatological element were eliminated from the interpretation, the parable would lose its main force. Wellhausen argues that the idea that God—rather than the Messiah—acts as Judge is Jewish, and that therefore the parable must be of early date; the parable expresses the hopes of the early Christian community for vindication against their Jewish persecutors. Wellhausen holds the parallel parable (xi. 5 f.) to be secondary.

Close parallels may be noted in wording and thought between this parable and Ecclus. xxxv. 15 f. There is perhaps direct literary influence.

The interpretation of the parable is complete with 8a. 8b appears to be an independent reflection which has been added later.

The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican is another and the last of the Lucan illustrative stories (cf. x. 25 Introd.). The simple and skilful portraiture of the two men resembles the art of the parables of the Good Samaritan and of the Prodigal Son.

VIII. 1 Ἔλεγεν δὲ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε
2 προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ μὴ ἐνκακεῖν, λέγων Κριτής τις
ἦν ἔν τινι πόλει τὸν θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενος καὶ ἄνθρωπον

1. αὐτοῖς] i.e. the disciples, cf. xvii. 22.

2. τὸν θεὸν μὴ . . . μὴ ἐντρεπόμενος] For the double characterisation

μὴ ἐντρεπόμενος. χήρα δὲ ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ καὶ 3
ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγουσα Ἐκδίκησόν με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου
μου. καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἐπὶ χρόνον, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ 4
εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ Εἰ καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπον
ἐντρέπομαι, διά γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόπον τὴν 5
χήραν ταύτην ἐκδικήσω αὐτήν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τέλος ἐρχομένη
ὑπωπιάζῃ με. Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος Ἀκούσατε τί ὁ κριτὴς 6
τῆς ἀδικίας λέγει· ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν 7
τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός,
καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς; λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ποιήσει τὴν 8
ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν τάχει. πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ἐλθὼν ἆρα εὑρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;

cf. Dion. Hal. x. 10. 7 οὔτε θεῖον φοβηθέντες χολὸν οὔτ᾽ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐντραπέντες νέμεσιν.

4. εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ] The soliloquy is very frequent in the parables peculiar to Lk. Cf. xii. 17, xv. 17, xvi. 3. But also xii. 45 = Mt. xxiv. 48.

εἰ καὶ . . . οὐ . . . διά γε τὸ . . .] Cf. xi. 8.

5. ἐρχομένη ὑπωπιάζῃ] ὑπωπιάζειν properly 'to strike someone in the face,' 'to give a black eye'; also in a more extended sense but still connoting physical violence, 1 Cor. ix. 27, 'I handle my body roughly,' and Aristoph. *Pax* 541 of cities devastated by war. To interpret of physical assault here would give good sense and make an effective contrast to παρέχειν κόπον above. So Wellh., Klostermann. But the present tenses are against this. We should expect ἐλθοῦσα ὑπωπιάσῃ. It is better to assume a metaph. use of the word: 'lest her visits end in causing me grave trouble.'

6. ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας] Cf. τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, xvi. 8 and n.

7. καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς;] The meaning and grammar are alike obscure. The clause is taken by some (e.g. Bengel, Plummer, J. Weiss) as a pendant to βοώντων: the elect cry to God, and God patiently hears their cry. But this obscures the point that, for the time being, God does not intervene, though he will shortly do so. It seems better, therefore, with Wellh., to translate 'does God restrain his anger?' i.e. is God patient at the misdoings of those who ill-treat the elect? ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς then means 'in the case of the elect,' and is not governed by μακροθυμεῖ as Mt. xviii. 26, 29; Ja. v. 7. But the change of tense after ποιήσῃ is awkward; likewise the conjunction of two questions of which the former expects the answer 'yes,' and the latter the answer 'no.' "Bad Greek, perhaps bad translation, or both at once," Wellh. Jülicher suspects a gloss from Ecclus. xxxv. 22.

8. πλὴν . . . ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] This verse strikes a different note from the urgency of the preceding parable. We revert to the theme of the paragraph which precedes the parable—the coming of the Son of Man—and the anxious question is propounded, What is the state which the Son of Man will find when he

9 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ πρός τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτοῖς
ὅτι εἰσὶν δίκαιοι καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντας τοὺς λοιποὺς τὴν παρα-
10 βολὴν ταύτην. Ἄνθρωποι δύο ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν
11 προσεύξασθαι, εἷς Φαρισαῖος καὶ ὁ ἕτερος τελώνης. ὁ
Φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς ταῦτα πρὸς ἑαυτὸν προσηύχετο Ὁ
θεός, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ὥσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν
ἀνθρώπων, ἅρπαγες, ἄδικοι, μοιχοί, ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τε-
12 λώνης· νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδεκατεύω πάντα
13 ὅσα κτῶμαι. ὁ δὲ τελώνης μακρόθεν ἑστὼς οὐκ ἤθελεν
οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπᾶραι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀλλ᾽ ἔτυπτε
τὸ στῆθος ἑαυτοῦ λέγων Ὁ θεός, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρ-
14 τωλῷ. λέγω ὑμῖν, κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος εἰς τὸν

10 *ο ετερος*] *εις* D 11 *ταυτα προς εαυτον* ℵ$^c$BL 1 etc: *καθ εαυτον ταυτα* D syr.vt arm: *ταυτα* ℵ* lat.vt; *προς εαυτον ταυτα* A a al pler ϛ

comes? τὴν πίστιν, 'the faith,' i.e. the faith of the Christian Church. The saying, perhaps, echoes the anxiety of a Church leader distressed at the inroads of strange teachings.

9. πρός τινας] The Pharisees are meant, but not named, since a Pharisee is a character in the parable. πρός may mean that these were the persons addressed (as e.g. xvii. 1 and often), or, more probably, it should be translated 'with regard to' or 'against.' ὅτι, 'that,' not (with Grotius) 'because.'

10. ἀνέβησαν] The two went up from the city to the temple mount.

προσεύξασθαι] Perhaps at one of the stated hours of prayer. Cf. i. 10; Ac. iii. 1.

11. σταθείς] 'took up his position.' Contrast ἑστώς *v.* 13. πρὸς ἑαυτόν, whether placed before or after ταῦτα, must be taken with προσηύχετο: 'he prayed with himself.' It would be more in keeping with custom and with the tenor of the parable if he prayed aloud. The reading of D, supported by syr.vt, yields a better sense: 'took up his position by himself and prayed thus.'

εὐχαριστῶ] The thanksgiving is not feigned. The Pharisee is truly thankful that he has fulfilled what God's law demands.

12. Not only does the Pharisee fulfil the requirements of the law, but he does more than the law asks.

νηστεύω δίς] Self-imposed fasts were observed by pious Jews on Mondays and Thursdays (see Schürer, ii. p. 573). Christians took over the practice, but changed the days to Wednesdays and Fridays (*Didache* viii. 1).

πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι] 'all that I receive': i.e. he pays a tithe on all his income—not on all that he possesses. πάντα is emphatic. The law prescribed the payment of tithes on produce (Num. xviii. 21; Deut. xiv. 22 f.). Pharisaic zeal extended this to garden herbs, Mt. xxiii. 23, with Klostermann *ad loc.*

13. οὐδέ] To be taken with the whole clause: 'would not even look up to heaven.'

ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ] *De nemine alio homine cogitat*, Bengel.

14. δεδικαιωμένος] i.e. accepted with God. The doctrine of the

*οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐκεῖνον· ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.*

parables of *c.* xv. is reasserted: γίνεται χαρὰ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι.

πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν κτλ.] This saying has already been given above, xiv. 11. Cf. Mt. xxiii. 12.

### Children blessed. A Rich Man who would inherit Eternal Life. The Passion foretold (xviii. 15-34)

Luke now resumes the thread of the Marcan narrative which he dropped at ix. 50, and with certain additions, omissions, and amplifications he continues to follow it to the end. The adjustment to the other material is not obtrusive. In the Gospel as it stands there is no clear break between the last section and the Marcan sections which follow now. We are still on the road to Jerusalem.

Luke has dropped Mk. x. 1-12 (on Divorce). Probably he considered that xvi. 18 already sufficiently gave Christ's teaching on this subject. The blessing of the infants, the question of the rich man, with the sayings on the dangers of wealth and the rewards of renunciation, and the last prophecy of the Passion, are in the same order as in Mark and reproduce the Marcan text with but slight changes.

*Προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅπτηται·* 15
*ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσεκαλέσατο* 16
*[αὐτὰ] λέγων Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός*
*με καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία*
*τοῦ θεοῦ. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται τὴν* 17
*βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.*

*Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων λέγων Διδάσκαλε* 18

16 προσεκαλεσατο αυτα] om αυτα B

15-17 = Mk. x. 13-16; Mt. xix. 13-15. Luke omits to say that Jesus was vexed with the disciples, and he omits to say that he embraced the children. For the latter omission (also om. Mt.) cf. ix. 48 *supra* = Mk. ix. 36. There is a reluctance to ascribe strong emotion to Jesus. It is prob. due to the same motive that D lat.vt (codd.) syr.vt substitute προσκαλεσάμενος for ἐναγκαλισάμενος in Mk. x. 16.

15. τὰ βρέφη] 'their infants' (cf. ii. 12-16) for Mk. παιδία. βρέφη is less appropriate, as some conscious capacity in the children seems needed to give point to the saying concerning receiving the Kingdom of God as a little child.

17. ὡς παιδίον] i.e. with the disposition of a child.

18-23 = Mk. x. 17 f.; Mt. xix. 16 f.

18. ἄρχων] Not in Mk. An inference from the questioner's great wealth. Mt. makes the man 'a youth,' and therefore drops ἐκ

19 ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; εἶπεν δὲ
αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ
20 μὴ εἷς [ὁ] θεός. τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας Μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, Μὴ
φονεύσῃς, Μὴ κλέψῃς, Μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, Τίμα τὸν
21 πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ταῦτα πάντα
22 ἐφύλαξα ἐκ νεότητος. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ
Ἔτι ἕν σοι λείπει· πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον καὶ διάδος
πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο
23 ἀκολούθει μοι. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα περίλυπος ἐγενήθη,
24 ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα. Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν
25 βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσπορεύονται· εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν
κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν

19 *εις ο θεος*] om *ο* ℵ*B* 22 *ουρανοις*] praem *τοις* BD 24 *ο Ιησους*] om *ο* B

*νεότητος* in the man's reply to Jesus. Luke omits the detail of the Marcan setting that the man came running and kneeling to Jesus as he was setting out on the road. He also omits Mk.'s statement that Jesus loved the man.

*τί ποιήσας . . . κληρονομήσω;*] More idiomatic than Mk. *τί ποιήσω ἵνα . . .;*

19. Unlike Mt. Lk. does not stumble at the words of Jesus, *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός.*

22. Lk. somewhat strengthens the form of the renunciation which is required by adding *πάντα*. *διάδος*] 'distribute.' An improvement on *δός* (Mk.).

24-26. A greatly weakened version of Mk. x. 23-27. In Mk. the rich man goes away (*ἀπῆλθεν v.* 22; om. Lk. *v.* 23), whereupon Jesus looks round on his disciples and addresses them. Contrast *ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰ. εἶπεν v.* 24. Verses 24, 25 compress into one two distinct speeches of Mk., of which the latter is a heightened repetition of the former. The increasing astonishment of the disciples so graphically portrayed in Mk. disappears, and the exclamation *καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;* is transferred from the disciples to the Jewish audience in the background (*εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες, v.* 26). In Mk. Jesus again 'looks on' the disciples before he utters the final words, and these themselves are far more vigorously rendered in Mk. than in Lk. (*v.* 27).

24. The Rabbinic attitude towards wealth is discussed by Abrahams, *Studies*, i. pp. 113 f. The Rabbis recognised that poverty was an evil. "There is [in Rabbinic teaching] no cult of poverty, neither is there a cult of wealth. Both are conditions of good and ill rather than good and ill themselves. Not the possession of wealth but too absolute a devotion to its acquisition and too ready a surrender to its temptations were feared." It is natural that the more radical attitude of this saying should cause astonishment in a Jewish circle.

25. *τρήματος βελόνης*] 'the eye of a needle,' for *τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος*

*βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες* 26
*Καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ* 27
*ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστίν. Εἶπεν* 28
*δὲ ὁ Πέτρος Ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφέντες τὰ ἴδια ἠκολουθήσαμέν*
*σοι. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδείς ἐστιν* 29
*ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα*
*εἵνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ λάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα* 30
*ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ*
*ζωὴν αἰώνιον.*

*Παραλαβὼν δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Ἰδοὺ* 31
*ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ*
*γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·*

30 *λαβη* BD al: *απολαβη* ℵΔL al pler *πολλαπλασιονα*] *επταπλασιονα* D lat. vt syr. hl-mg Diat Cypr: *εκατονταπλασιονα* syr. vt

Mk. Cf. Phryn. lxxii. *βελόνη καὶ βελονοπώλης ἀρχαῖα, ἡ δὲ ῥαφὶς τί ἐστιν οὐκ ἄν τις γνοίη.* In truth *ῥαφίς* is the older word which had been replaced by *βελόνη* in Attic. See Rutherford *ad loc.*

28 f. As Luke tells the story, the disciples in the person of Peter here first intervene. They have renounced all: what then is to be their reward? The answer is that they will indeed be rewarded both in this age and in the age to come. It is remarkable that Lk. has omitted the words *μετὰ διωγμῶν* which in Mk. qualify the reward in this present world. Mt. leaves the promise of reward general without referring either to this world or the world to come, and appends the parable of the labourers in the vineyard to interpret the nature of the reward.

29. *ἢ γυναῖκα*] Lk. alone adds this. Cf. xiv. 26 *supra*. He omits 'sisters,' gives 'parents' for 'mother or father,' and omits 'lands.'

30. *πολλαπλασίονα*] In agreement with Mt. against Mk. *ἑκατονταπλασίονα.* But we should probably read *ἑπταπλασίονα* with D lat.vt. Both Mt. and Lk. omit from Mk. the repetition of the goods which the disciple may have renounced. Lk. omits the saying with which the section ends in Mk.: 'Many that are first shall be last, and the last first.' He has already given it at xiii. 30 in what he probably considered to be a more appropriate setting.

31-34. The third and last of the predictions of the Passion which Lk. has taken over from Mk. But in Lk. the two former (ix. 22, 43-45) are widely separated from the last owing to the interpolations of the central section. Another brief prophecy of the Passion has been introduced above at xvii. 25. The preceding verse in Mk. (x. 32 *ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο*) is omitted. The former part seemed superfluous (see *v.* 31 *Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ*), and a partial equiva-

32 παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ
33 ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται, καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν
αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται.
34 Καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνῆκαν, καὶ ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο
κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα.

lent for the latter is to appear *infra* *v.* 28. The prophecy in Lk. is amplified by a characteristic reference to the scriptures in which the death of the Messiah had been foretold. This prepares the way for the interpretation of the scriptures which the Risen Christ gives to his disciples, xxiv. 27, 45 f. Luke adds to the prophecy the statement that the disciples did not at this time understand what was said.

32. *παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*] Mk. gives "And the Son of Man shall be given up to the chief priests and to the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death and give him up to the Gentiles," and this corresponds to the Marcan Passion narrative, where sentence of death is passed by the High Priest. In Lk. the Sanhedrin do not condemn Jesus to death, but hand him over to Pilate. The abbreviation and modification of Mark here is probably therefore made in view of what is to follow.

*καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται*] Add. Luc.

### Jesus at Jericho: the Healing of a Blind Man, Zacchaeus the Publican the Host of Jesus (xviii. 35–xix. 10)

Luke has omitted at this point the Marcan narrative of the request of the sons of Zebedee (Mk. x. 35-45). A parallel version of some of the sayings of Jesus connected with that incident in Mark is included in the narrative of the Last Supper (xxii. 24 f.), and with Mk. x. 38 compare Lk. xii. 50. Luke's general tendency to avoid phrases and incidents which might appear to reflect upon the character of the Apostles would incline him to pass over the section.

Then follows the next Marcan paragraph: the healing of the blind man. The modifications are slight except that in Mark Jesus heals the blind man as he leaves Jericho, whereas in Luke the healing takes place as Jesus draws near to the city. The evangelist has little concern for accuracy or fidelity to his source in a detail of this kind, if it suits the purpose of his general presentation to make a change. His motive here was probably that of providing an introduction to the story of Zacchaeus which he has worked into the Marcan narrative at this point. The crowd which attends Jesus as he enters the city (*v.* 36, cf. Mk. x. 46) leads up to the story of the little chief publican, Zacchaeus, who climbs a tree in order to see Jesus as he enters, and is chosen by Jesus to be his host.

The story of Zacchaeus is another of a group of incidents peculiar to Luke which appear to be later and secondary counterparts to stories in Mark. The hospitality of Zacchaeus is to the hospitality of Levi what the healing of the ten lepers is to the healing of the leper of Mark i. 40 f. See Introd. p. lxviii. The latter part of the scene is very vaguely filled in. It is not easy to see when or where Zacchaeus 'stood and said to the Lord, Behold the half of my goods,' etc., nor when, where, and in whose presence the Lord pronounced the blessing on his host. The heart of the story is to be sought in the last two verses. Zacchaeus, though an outcast in public estimation, is yet a care to the Son of Man and a true son of Abraham. Loisy suggests that in the collocation of the two stories, the healing of the blind man and Zacchaeus, the evangelist is moved by a conscious symbolism: the blind man typifies Judaeo-Christians ('Jesus, thou Son of David,' *v.* 38) and Zacchaeus Gentile Christians. The question whether or not Zacchaeus was a son of Abraham by birth is, Loisy holds, irrelevant. The point of the saying of Jesus is that Zacchaeus was a *spiritual* son of Abraham (cf. Gal. iii. 9, 29; Rom. iv. 11 f.) and thus typifies the Gentile believer who is heir to the promise made to Abraham. This, however, appears to attribute to the evangelist a more definite symbolism than the narratives warrant. On the other hand Wellhausen is surely too literal when he interprets *v.* 9 to imply that Jesus would not have entered the house of a heathen. From the point of view of the narrative the heathen are not at all in question. The thought is simply that Zacchaeus, though an outcast to the murmurers, is yet one of God's people. It was easy to apply the thought to the position of Gentiles in the eyes of Jews and Judaisers, but the application is not made in the text.

*'Εγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς 'Ιερειχὼ τυφλός* 35
*τις ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπαιτῶν. ἀκούσας δὲ ὄχλου* 36
*διαπορευομένου ἐπυνθάνετο τί εἴη τοῦτο· ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ* 37
*αὐτῷ ὅτι 'Ιησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος παρέρχεται. καὶ ἐβόησεν* 38
*λέγων 'Ιησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυείδ, ἐλέησόν με. καὶ οἱ προάγοντες* 39
*ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ ἵνα σιγήσῃ· αὐτὸς δὲ πολλῷ μᾶλλον*
*ἔκραζεν Υἱὲ Δαυείδ, ἐλέησόν με. σταθεὶς δὲ 'Ιησοῦς* 40

35. *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ κτλ.*] Lucan constr., cf. i. 8 n. Luke omits the name of the blind man: *Βαρτίμαιος.*

36. *ἐπυνθάνετο . . . ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτῷ ὅτι*] The blind man's question is supplied by Luke out of Mk. *ἀκούσας ὅτι. εἴη*] Optat. in indirect question Lucan.

38. *'Ιησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυείδ*] From Mk. The blind man hails Jesus as the Davidic Messiah. In Lk. as in Mk. this is the first and only occasion on which Jesus is thus directly addressed. The address prepares for the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, cf. *v.* 38 *infra ὁ βασιλεύς.*

40. Luke omits as superfluous graphic touches from Mk.: that

ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν. ἐγγίσαντος δὲ
41 αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν Τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; ὁ δὲ
42 εἶπεν Κύριε, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
43 αὐτῷ Ἀνάβλεψον· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. καὶ
παραχρῆμα ἀνέβλεψεν, καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ δοξάζων τὸν
θεόν. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἰδὼν ἔδωκεν αἶνον τῷ θεῷ.

XIX. 1 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο τὴν Ἰερειχώ. Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ
2 ὀνόματι καλούμενος Ζακχαῖος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἀρχιτελώνης
3 καὶ αὐτὸς πλούσιος· καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστιν,
καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου ὅτὶ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ μικρὸς ἦν.
4 καὶ προδραμὼν εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν
5 ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐκείνης ἤμελλεν διέρχεσθαι. καὶ ὡς
ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἀναβλέψας [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς
αὐτόν Ζακχαῖε, σπεύσας κατάβηθι, σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ
6 οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μεῖναι. καὶ σπεύσας κατέβη, καὶ ὑπεδέξατο
7 αὐτὸν χαίρων. καὶ ἰδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον

5 ο Ιησους] om ο B

word is brought to the blind man that Jesus calls him; that the man leaped up and threw off his cloak to come to Jesus.

41. Κύριε] Mk. Ῥαββουνεί. As usual, Lk. avoids foreign words.

43. καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ] To swell the multitude who were to hail the entrance of the Messiah into the Holy City. Luke characteristically adds that the man and all the people gave praise to God.

1. εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο] Wellh. finds a contradiction here with the story which follows, in which it is implied that Jesus is still without the city. Trees would not grow in the narrow streets of an oriental city.

2. Ζακχαῖος] For the name זַכַּי cf. Ezr. ii. 9; Neh. vii. 14; Jos. *Vit.* 46 Σακχαῖος *v.l.* Ζακχαῖος. It is an abbreviation of Zachariah. By etymology the name may mean 'pure,' but this is not, as has been suggested, significant. Lk. nowhere uses names with a symbolic purpose. Acc. to Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv. 6. 35, Zacchaeus was identified by some with Matthias. For the tradition in the Clementines that he became Bishop of Caesarea see Zahn *ad loc.*

ἀρχιτελώνης] The word is not attested elsewhere. Jericho would naturally be an important customs station from its position at the passage of the Jordan from Judaea to the lands E. of Jordan.

3. καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν] We need not suppose that he is yet moved by penitence for his exactions. *Fama notum vultu noscere cupiebat*, Grotius.

4. ἐκείνης, sc. ὁδοῦ. Cf. *v.* 19 ποίας with note.

5. Ζακχαῖε] How Jesus knew the publican's name is not said.

7. διεγόγγυζον] The murmuring appears to take place outside the house after Jesus has entered with Zacchaeus: ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν (*v.* 6), εἰσῆλθεν (*v.* 7). But the words of

λέγοντες ὅτι Παρὰ ἁμαρτωλῷ ἀνδρὶ εἰσῆλθεν καταλῦσαι.
σταθεὶς δὲ Ζακχαῖος εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰδοὺ τὰ 8
ἡμίσιά μου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, κύριε, [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς δίδωμι,
καὶ εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα ἀποδίδωμι τετραπλοῦν. εἶπεν 9
δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Σήμερον σωτηρία τῷ οἴκῳ
τούτῳ ἐγένετο, καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ [ἐστιν]· ἦλθεν 10
γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆϲαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλόϲ.

8 *τοις* om B 248 9 *ο Ιησους*] om *ο* B *εστιν* om ℵ*LR

Jesus in *v.* 9 are as much a reply to the murmurers as to Zacchaeus. Note the 3rd pers. used in speaking of Zacchaeus: καθότι καὶ αὐτός. The sequence is not mended if with Bultmann (p. 17) we regard the speech of Zacchaeus (*v* 8) as an interpolation by the evangelist into his source. This is one of many scenes in the Gospel where the detail, if pressed, is found to be lacking in verisimilitude.

8. πτωχοῖς δίδωμι] The present tense describes here a present resolve, not, as e.g. in xviii. 12, a present habit. To suppose that Z. is justifying himself is to miss the spirit of the story. He declares that half of his fortune he makes over to the poor, and out of the remainder he restores fourfold to any he has wronged. Ex. xxii. 1 requires four sheep to be restored for one stolen. Fourfold restitution for *furtum manifestum* is found in Roman law. See Wettst. The meaning here is simply that Z. of his own will makes ample restitution.

## THE PARABLE OF THE POUNDS (xix. 11-28)

The parable of the Pounds finds a close parallel in the parable of the Talents which Matthew gives (*c.* xxv.) between the parable of the Ten Virgins and the description of the Last Judgement with which he closes his narrative of the teaching and preaching of Jesus. The verbal resemblances between the Matthaean and the Lucan parables, especially towards the close, make it almost certain that there is literary relationship. And in spite of striking differences the story in each Gospel is fundamentally the same: a man leaves money in the hands of his servants and on his return he makes a reckoning with them. Those who have made good use of what was entrusted to them are entrusted with more power and responsibility, while the servant who has merely preserved his trust is reprimanded and made to forfeit his money to the most successful of his fellow-servants. The parable itself is not found in Mark, but the image of the man going into a far country and entrusting duties and authority to his servants during his absence is found in Mk. xiii. 34 f. It is worthy of note that in Mark, as above xii. 42 = Mt. xxiv. 45 f., the servants are in charge of a household or an estate, not, as here, of capital to be invested.

The chief difference between the Lucan form of the parable and that in Matthew is that in Luke the man who goes away is a nobleman who goes to receive a kingdom, and that the disloyal behaviour of the citizens and their subsequent punishment by the returned king blend—somewhat incongruously—with the story of the man's dealings with his servants. This theme is clearly secondary. Verses 12, 14, 15a, 27 may be excised without affecting the parable of the Pounds. It is to be noted that the parable of the Marriage Feast in Matthew has been similarly amplified (xxii. 7). Harnack holds that a single parable originally independent has been differently attached in the two Gospels. The additional matter, however, in each case is not so much a parable as an allegorical expansion designed to relate and interpret the rejection of Jesus by the Jews and the downfall of Jerusalem. The spirit of the Lucan addition is the spirit of the conclusion of the parable of the Unjust Judge (xviii. 1 f.). Perhaps Luke took both parables from the same source.

The setting of the parable in Luke determines the interpretation which the evangelist sets upon it. Jesus is drawing near to Jerusalem surrounded by an enthusiastic crowd, who expect, as the Apostles expected after the Resurrection (Acts i.), and as many of the evangelist's own contemporaries were still expecting, that " the kingdom of God would immediately appear." In the parable Jesus teaches that he must first go away in order to receive the kingdom, and an interval must elapse before he returns. That interval is, for his disciples, a time of testing and, according to the quality of their service during that interval, will be their status in the kingdom when the Lord comes back. When the return takes place it will involve not only the reward of the faithful, but also the punishment of the disloyal citizens, i.e. the Jews.

Jülicher argues that the idea of the Parousia which governs the meaning of the parable as it now stands both in Matthew and Luke has been superimposed upon an older story which was, in the true sense of the word, a parable, i.e. it was a story from ordinary life, which afforded an analogy with some aspect of God's dealings with men—in this case God's judgement upon men's lives. The 'allegorical' element, unmistakable in the story as it stands, is secondary. Originally the man who went on a journey was not Christ, but a neutral character sketched from life. Jülicher argues that if the man had originally been intended for Christ, he would not have been described in the parable as " an austere man, reaping where he had not sown," etc. Jülicher's general theory as to the possible literary history of the parable may be right, but to his chief argument, summarised above, Wellhausen well replies that the Lord is a harsh taskmaster to the idle servant alone, and that because the idle servant has not his Lord's business in his heart. Those who make their lord's interest their own find that their duty becomes a joyful service.

Artistically, and in a broad sense historically, the setting in Luke is good, but it does not carry conviction from the point of view of historical realism. The audience in Jericho could not have been expected to discover the implications of the parable as they are presented in the evangelist's introduction.

Eusebius (Mai, *Nov. Patr. Bibl.* iv. 1, p. 155 = Preuschen, 7) preserves from the Gospel according to the Hebrews another and much tamer version of the parable. In this version the Master had three servants, to each of whom he committed a talent. One—like the prodigal son—devoured his master's substance with harlots and flute-girls, another multiplied his talent by trading, while the third hid his talent. The last was merely rebuked, the first was shut up in prison, and the other rewarded.

*Ἀκουόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα προσθεὶς εἶπεν παραβολὴν* 11
*διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἰερουσαλὴμ αὐτὸν καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς*
*ὅτι παραχρῆμα μέλλει ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναφαίνεσθαι·*
*εἶπεν οὖν Ἄνθρωπός τις εὐγενὴς ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν* 12
*μακρὰν λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ βασιλείαν καὶ ὑποστρέψαι. καλέσας* 13
*δὲ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα μνᾶς καὶ εἶπεν*

11. *ἀκουόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα*] The parable therefore is presumably spoken in the house of Zacchaeus. But the exact situation is not clearly made out by the evangelist. Cf. *v.* 7 n.

*προσθεὶς εἶπεν*] A Hebraism, וַיּוֹסֶף לְ. Cf. xx. 11 *προσέθετο πέμψαι*, and for *προσθείς* Gen. xxxviii. 5, Job xxix. 1, LXX. The meaning is, 'he went on to speak a parable.' Cf. Blass, §§ 74. 2; 69. 4; Introd. p. lxxxi.

*διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς . . . ἀναφαίνεσθαι*] The evangelist similarly assigns a purpose for the parable of the Unrighteous Judge, xviii. 1. The narrative of the request of the sons of Zebedee which Lk. has omitted from Mk. shewed that the disciples at this time entertained high hopes of the immediate appearance of the kingdom, and perhaps that narrative has indirectly influenced Lk. here.

12. *χώραν μακράν*] The country is distant, and therefore some time must elapse before the nobleman can return as king. The circumstances described here and in *v.* 14 reflect the political relations of the Herodian princes with Rome. Cf. esp. the history of Archelaus, Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 11. 1.

13. The contrast with Mt. is remarkable. In Mt. the man has *three* servants, and he divides his property among them—not equally, but according to their ability. To one he gives the considerable sum of five talents, to another two, to another one. Here the nobleman calls ten of his servants and gives to each the trifling sum of one mina

14 *πρὸς αὐτοὺς πραγματεύσασθαι ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι. Οἱ δὲ*
*πολῖται αὐτοῦ ἐμίσουν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν πρεσβείαν*
*ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ λέγοντες Οὐ θέλομεν τοῦτον βασιλεῦσαι*
15 *ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθεῖν αὐτὸν λαβόντα*
*τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ εἶπεν φωνηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς δούλους*
*τούτους οἷς δεδώκει τὸ ἀργύριον, ἵνα γνοῖ τί διεπραγμα-*
16 *τεύσαντο. παρεγένετο δὲ ὁ πρῶτος λέγων Κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ*
17 *σου δέκα προσηργάσατο μνᾶς. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Εὖγε,*
*ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε, ὅτι ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ πιστὸς ἐγένου, ἴσθι ἐξουσίαν*
18 *ἔχων ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων. καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ δεύτερος λέγων*
19 *Ἡ μνᾶ σου, κύριε, ἐποίησεν πέντε μνᾶς. εἶπεν δὲ καὶ*
20 *τούτῳ Καὶ σὺ ἐπάνω γίνου πέντε πόλεων. καὶ ὁ ἕτερος*
*ἦλθεν λέγων Κύριε, ἰδοὺ ἡ μνᾶ σου ἣν εἶχον ἀποκειμέ-*
21 *νην ἐν σουδαρίῳ· ἐφοβούμην γάρ σε ὅτι ἄνθρωπος αὐ-*
*στηρὸς εἶ, αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας καὶ θερίζεις ὃ οὐκ ἔσπει-*

(perhaps £4) with which they are to trade in his absence. In *v.* 16 we hear of three servants only as in Mt., and we may perhaps infer that the 'ten servants' is a modification. *δούλους* has no article. The nobleman would probably have more than ten slaves. "It is better that the servants should all receive the same sum, rather than that they should receive different sums 'according to their capacity' (Mt. xxv. 15), for it is their capacity which the lord wishes first to test; he does not know it beforehand," Wellh.

Unlike Mt., Lk. does not directly recount the proceedings of the slaves during their master's absence. This is sufficiently told in the report to the lord on his return.

16-19. In Mt. the two industrious servants each succeed in doubling the amount entrusted to them. In Luke they make different profits on the same original sum.

17. *ἴσθι ἐξουσίαν . . . πόλεων*] The contrast is better in Mt.: 'because thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will set thee over many things.' But the 'cities' fit in with the conception of the king and his kingdom, and may be ascribed to the influence of the story of the king upon the original story of the pounds. In xvi. 10 we have the same thought with a simple contrast between 'little' and 'much.' The incongruity of the reference to the 'cities' becomes yet greater at *v.* 24 where the one *mina* is taken from the idle servant and given to the servant who had made ten *minae*. It is a strange recompense for a man who has just been set over ten cities. It is to be noted that Mt. passes from parable into interpretation when he adds to the master's words of approval 'Enter thou into the joy of the Lord,' and so again when he consigns the idle servant to 'outer darkness.' Luke remains throughout within the limits of the story.

18. The slothful servant in Mt. buried his talent in the earth.

21. *αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας*] Proverbial for unjust appropriation of another's

*ρας. λέγει αὐτῷ Ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου κρίνω σε, πονηρὲ* 22
*δοῦλε· ᾔδεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρός εἰμι, αἴρων ὃ*
*οὐκ ἔθηκα καὶ θερίζων ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρα; καὶ διὰ τί οὐκ* 23
*ἔδωκάς μου τὸ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τράπεζαν; κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν*
*τόκῳ ἂν αὐτὸ ἔπραξα. καὶ τοῖς παρεστῶσιν εἶπεν Ἄρατε* 24
*ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὴν μνᾶν καὶ δότε τῷ τὰς δέκα μνᾶς ἔχοντι·—*
*καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς·—λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι* 25 26
*παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ*
*ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται. Πλὴν τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου τούτους τοὺς* 27
*μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεῦσαι ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἀγάγετε ὧδε καὶ*
*κατασφάξατε αὐτοὺς ἔμπροσθέν μου. Καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα* 28
*ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα.*

25 om vers DW 69 al pauc b c syr.vt boh Lucif 26 *δοθησεται*] *προστιθεται* D : *προστεθησεται* d syr.sin Clem : add *και προστεθησεται* sin.cur : add *και περισσευθησεται* 69 etc vg (codd) Cyr (cf. Matt xxv. 29)

labour. Cf. Philo *ap.* Eus. *Praep.* viii. 7 *ἃ μὴ κατέθηκεν, μηδ᾽ ἀναιρεῖσθαι, μηδ᾽ ἐκ πρασιᾶς, μηδ᾽ ἐκ ληνοῦ, μηδὲ ἐξ ἅλωνος*; Jos. *c. Ap.* ii. 30 *κἂν ὑφέληταί τις ἀλλότριον, κἂν ὃ μὴ κατέθηκεν ἀνέληται, πάντων εἰσὶ κολάσεις*, and for further exx. see Bernays, *Gesch. Abhandl.* i. pp. 272 f.

24 f. This verse introduces a new thought. The man who has succeeded already will carry his success further, while the man who has not increased his possessions will lose what he has. Lk. has already (viii. 18) given the saying in *v.* 26, reproducing it from Mk. It will have been generally current and available for appropriate use. In the present context the speaker is still the king in the parable, not Jesus. The interruption in *v.* 25 is very awkward, and the textual authority for its omission is strong enough to make it probable that it is an interpolation.

27. We revert abruptly to the disloyal citizens who have not been mentioned since *v.* 14. We are to understand the Jews, who refused Christ as their king. It was a not infrequent practice that the vanquished should be slain in the presence of the victor. Cf. 1 Regn. xv. 33 (Agag slain by Samuel); Plut. *Comp. Lysan. et Sull.* 476 D *καὶ Λουκρήτιον Ὀφέλλαν . . . ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀποσφάξαι προσέταξε* (*Σύλλας*); Caesar *B.C.* iii. 28. 4 "qui omnes ad eum (Otacilium Crassum) producti contra religionem iurisiurandi in eius conspectu crudelissime interficiuntur." The vengeance of the king recalls the tone of xviii. 1-8. It is very different in spirit from the lament over Jerusalem below, *vv.* 41-44, and the difference is perhaps in favour of the hypothesis that except for the preface in *v.* 11 Luke is not himself responsible for the amplification of the parable, which may have stood in the source as we read it now.

28. Cf. Mk. x. 32 (the beginning of the paragraph omitted by Lk. after *v.* 34).

### JESUS AT JERUSALEM (xix. 29 f.)

With certain modifications to be noted below, Luke's narrative of the entry into Jerusalem and of the events in Jerusalem which led up to the end reproduces the narrative of Mark.

Jesus, according to Mark's account, after receiving a Messianic ovation from his followers near the Mount of Olives, entered the city and proceeded to the Temple; then "after he had looked around at all things," he returned to Bethany with the Twelve for the night. The next day they return to Jerusalem. On the road Jesus curses the unfruitful fig-tree. Jesus again goes to the Temple, where he casts out the traders from the Temple courts and "overthrows the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those who sold the doves." His action aroused the hostility of the scribes and chief priests who, in their alarm at the extent of his support, forthwith tried to find him that they might put him out of the way. In the evening Jesus and the disciples again left the city. On the morning of the next day they return to Jerusalem. As they pass the fig-tree Peter observes that it has withered away. The incident calls forth sayings from Jesus on faith and prayer. On their return to Jerusalem Jesus walks in the Temple, where he is encountered by the chief priests, scribes, and elders, who question his authority. Jesus parries the questions, and then proceeds to expound in the allegory of the vineyard and its wicked husbandmen the history of the past and the fate which awaits both himself and the Jewish people. Again "they sought to take him, and they feared the multitude, for they knew that he had spoken the parable against them." Jesus is then further questioned, first by a combination of Pharisees and Herodians on the payment of tribute to Caesar, and then by Sadducees on belief in the Resurrection. He replies to and silences his questioners. Lastly, Jesus is questioned by a scribe as to the first commandment of the law, and the scribe endorsing his answer is commended by Jesus as being not far from the Kingdom of God. Jesus then in his turn asks a question to prove that the Christ is not David's son, but David's Lord. The day of questioning in the Temple ends with a denunciation of the pretensions of the scribes and the incident of the widow's mite. The words of the disciples, commenting on the great building of the Temple, as they leave, make the occasion for the great apocalyptic discourse which is delivered upon the Mount of Olives. Mark then proceeds to the events which led directly to the Crucifixion. Two days before the feast the priests and scribes were plotting his death. The feast at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper and the betrayal by Judas are recorded as happening in the interval which elapsed between the time of the plot and "the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover," on the evening of which day, as Mark tells the history, Jesus was arrested. The narrative of Mark from the entry into Jerusalem until the Resurrection falls into a definite chronological arrangement. Jesus was condemned by Pilate, crucified and buried on the day before the Sabbath, i.e. on Friday. On the Sabbath his body rested in the tomb. On the first day of the week the tomb was found empty. Reckoning backwards from this point, the feast at Bethany and the betrayal by Judas are placed in the interval between the note of time at xiv. 1 (two days before the feast) and the Thursday evening when the Last Supper was eaten—probably, therefore, on Wednesday. The questioning in the Temple and the eschatological discourse are then to be placed on the Tuesday. On the Monday Jesus cursed the fig-tree and cleansed the Temple. He entered Jerusalem in triumph on the Sunday. There is thus a very clear and definite chronological arrangement of the narrative in Mark. But a variety of considerations make it probable that this chronological arrangement was not itself given to Mark by tradition, but has been imposed by him upon his materials, for his materials in some degree witness against his own construction.

Since Mark's narrative is the basis of Luke's, it will be convenient to summarise here the chief difficulties to which Mark's narrative gives rise. The most striking inconsistency is that if the Last Supper was, as Mark asserts, the Passover, the priests do in actual fact what in xiv. 1 they are reported as saying that they will not do: they arrest Jesus at the time of the Feast. This question is considered further below. However, neither the Marcan dating nor the Johannine dating of the Crucifixion is incompatible with the Marcan chronological arrangement of the week. On either view the Last Supper was eaten on Thursday night and Jesus was crucified on Friday.

At xiv. 49 Jesus after his arrest says, "I was daily with you teaching in the Temple." This seems to suggest a much longer period of teaching in Jerusalem than the actual Marcan chronology allows. All the recorded teaching and disputing is confined to one day—the Tuesday. (On Monday also, after the clearing of the Temple, "the people were astonished at his teaching.") Moreover, as it has been often pointed out, Jesus clearly has connexions both with Jerusalem and with Bethany which are not easy to explain on the theory that Mark's 'Holy Week' exhausts the period of his Jerusalem ministry. Literary analysis indirectly confirms this conclusion, for it appears to indicate that the Marcan narrative represents a combination of materials which are not homogeneous. The eschatological discourse in Mk. xiii. has a character of its own which marks it off from the rest of the Gospel (see below), and the same applies to the parable of the wicked husbandmen, which in tone and content presents a striking contrast to the replies of Jesus to his assailants. The replies to the Sanhedrin and to the Sadducees are at once decisive and cautious. They seem directly intended to avoid forcing an issue. They are fully compatible with a consciousness on the part of Jesus that he stands in a position of grave peril, but nothing is said to anticipate the future, and the perspective of the Crucifixion which has controlled Mark's narrative since Peter's confession disappears for the time being. In the parable of the wicked husbandmen, on the other hand, Jesus clearly indicates that he is the Messiah, God's Son, and that he is to perish at the hands of his antagonists. The parable is regarded by many critics as an early apocalypse which sets the death of the Messiah in its due relation to the past history of God's people, and to the contemporary position of the Church. Even if we held with Professor Burkitt (*Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religion*, vol. ii. pp. 321 f.) that it goes back to Jesus himself, it is difficult to avoid suspicion of its present setting. It seems to have come from some independent source, and to have been incorporated with the succession of controversies between Jesus and his antagonists at Jerusalem. Loisy acutely notes that the sentence, "they left him and went away," Mk. xii. 12, is an awkward pendant to the account of the consultation of the chief priests and scribes how they might put him to death. Did they consult together in his presence and then leave him? On the other hand, these words would give a perfectly good conclusion to the preceding narrative concerning the authority of Jesus. Mk. xii. 1-12a has then, on this theory, been worked in by Mark into other material. Perhaps, as Loisy suggests, it led up in some earlier form of Gospel-writing directly to the Passion. The narratives of controversy seem again to form a series by themselves, which we may compare with the series of controversial incidents in the Galilean ministry grouped together in Mk. ii.-iii.

We now note the chief modifications which Luke has made in the Marcan source.

He has filled in the scene of the triumphal approach to Jerusalem with the complaint of Pharisees, who murmur at the enthusiasm of the disciples, and with the lament of Jesus over the city. It is possible to suppose that he uses another source, but it is not necessary to do so: both additions repeat motifs which we recognise elsewhere in the Gospel.

Luke has fused into one two separate Marcan visits to Jerusalem. In Luke, Jesus on his entry proceeds at once to the Temple and expels the traders. The incident is very briefly narrated, and it does not, as in Mark, provide the occasion of the question concerning the authority of Jesus. See notes on xix. 47, 48 and xx. 1. (Similarly in Luke's narrative of the Trial, the charge that Jesus had declared that he would destroy the Temple is dropped. Controversy concerning the Temple almost disappears from Luke's narrative of the last days.)

Luke has omitted the incident of the cursing of the unfruitful fig-tree, and the sayings of which it was the occasion in Mark. He almost certainly read it in Mark (cf. xvii. 6 *supra* with note), and for obvious reasons preferred to discard it.

By omitting to record the separate journeys of Jesus to and from Bethany, Luke has obscured the Marcan chronology of the last days. In their place he has substituted the general statement at xix. 47 that Jesus was teaching daily in the Temple. This is repeated again at xxi. 37, with the addition that at night he went out to lodge on the Mount of Olives. There is no indication as to the duration of the Jerusalem ministry.

Lastly, Luke has omitted the question of the scribe concerning the chief commandment (Mk. xii. 28-34). Like Matthew he stumbled at the approbation which in Mark Jesus pronounces upon a scribe. An alternative version in which the lawyer 'tempts' Jesus had already been given as an introduction to the parable of the Good Samaritan, x. 25 f.

Luke's treatment of his sources is then in keeping with his procedure elsewhere. The few omissions are readily explicable, and they are compensated for by other passages in the book. The expansions are subsidiary amplifications which all along presuppose the Marcan framework. The Marcan chronology is obscured, but Luke aims at smoothing and improving the transitions from one paragraph to another.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανιὰ πρὸς 29
τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν, ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθη-
τῶν λέγων Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην, ἐν ᾗ 30
εἰσπορευόμενοι εὑρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ᾽ ὃν οὐδεὶς

29. *καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς*] Lk. again introduces his favourite construction. Mk. *καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσι.*

29-33. "We must not rationalise here. Jesus has not already ordered the colt, nor made an arrangement with its owners, but he knows beforehand what will happen, because God, who directs what is to happen, is with him," Wellh. (*Ev. Marci*, p. 87).

*πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν, καὶ λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.*
31 *καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ Διὰ τί λύετε; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ὅτι*
32 *Ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει. ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπ-*
33 *εσταλμένοι εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν*
*τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς Τί λύετε*
34 *τὸν πῶλον; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν ὅτι Ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει.*
35 *καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐπιρίψαντες*
*αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐπὶ τὸν πῶλον ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν·*
36 *πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ὑπεστρώννυον τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτῶν ἐν*

30. *καὶ λύσαντες ἀγάγετε*] Mk. *λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε.* The Lucan version is weaker.

31. *ὁ κύριος . . . ἔχει*] From Mk. The Marcan parallel is the only passage in Mk. where *ὁ κύριος* is used of Jesus. Perhaps, as Wellh. suggests, the words are given an intentionally mysterious sound.

32. *ἀπελθόντες δέ*] Lk. again converts an independent principal verb into a participle (Mk. *καὶ ἀπῆλθον καί*), and substitutes *καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς* for the repetition and detail in Mk.'s account: *πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου.*

33. *οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ*] The owners of the colt are introduced by Lk. In Mk. the question is asked by 'some who stood by.'

35. *ἐπὶ τὸν πῶλον ἐπεβίβασαν*] Thus the prophecy of Zech. ix. 9 is fulfilled. The Messiah approaches Jerusalem "lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass." The scripture is cited in Mt. and Jo. It was certainly present to the mind of Mk. and Lk.

36-38. The differences from Mk. are here considerable, but they are in keeping with Lk.'s style and method. There is no necessity to conjecture (with Taylor) another written source. By adding the statement that the demonstration took place as Jesus drew near to the descent of the Mount of Olives, Lk. prepares for the lament which Jesus is to pronounce over the city when it comes into view. The cutting down of the palm branches is omitted from Mk., and we hear only of the strewing of garments before Jesus. That "the whole multitude of the disciples rejoiced and began to praise God with a great voice for all the wonders they had seen" is a characteristic Lucan expansion of Mark's sentence, "Those who went before and those who followed after cried out," cf. xviii. 43 *supra* and *passim.* In his version of the words of the people's cry, Luke omits, as his manner is, the foreign word 'Hosanna,' and for 'Hosanna in the highest' he substitutes 'peace in heaven and glory in the highest.' This recalls the angelic song in ii. 14, and here too the evangelist probably means us to think of the jubilation of the crowd as mingling with the triumphant songs of the angelic host in heaven. But in ii. 14 the words are 'peace on earth,' and this is very appropriate to the birth of the Prince of Peace. 'Peace in heaven' should here perhaps be interpreted of the gift of peace which is laid up in heaven for God's people. 'Peace on earth' at this moment in the history would not be in place. Contrast *v.* 42 *infra.* Luke also omits from

τῇ ὁδῷ. ἐγγίζοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ 37
Ὄρους τῶν Ἐλαιῶν ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν
χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ περὶ πασῶν ὧν
εἶδον δυνάμεων, λέγοντες 38

> Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος,
> ὁ *βασιλεύς*, ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου·
> ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη
> καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.

Καί τινες τῶν Φαρισαίων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπαν πρὸς 39
αὐτόν Διδάσκαλε, ἐπιτίμησον τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου. καὶ 40
ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν οὗτοι σιωπήσουσιν, οἱ
λίθοι κράξουσιν. Καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν, ἰδὼν τὴν 41

37 *απαν*] *απανταν* W Orig (In Joh x. 21)  *πασων . . . δυναμεων* codd paene omn: *παντων . . . δυναμεων* B 579: *παντων* (tantum) syr.vt: *παντων . . . γεινομενων* D 2: totum comma om c ff$^2$ i l s  38 *ο ερχομενος* om ℵH e l Orig  *ο βασιλευς* om WΛ* 579 al pauc vg(codd) boh(cod)

Mark, after the quotation from Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 26, the words: εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυείδ. Possibly he felt them to be out of place after *v.* 11 *supra*. Instead he has inserted ὁ βασιλεύς to stand in apposition to ὁ ἐρχόμενος. In Lk., therefore, Jesus is explicitly hailed as the Messianic king; the same is almost certainly implied in Mk., though Schweitzer holds that in Mk. ὁ ἐρχόμενος means Elijah, *Mystery of the Kingdom of God*, E.T. pp. 1-55.

37. περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων] This seems out of place. The only miracle which has been recorded since the healing of the ten lepers on the borders of Samaria and Galilee (xvii. 11) is the healing of the blind man outside Jericho. The reading of D περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδον γινομένων, partially supported by B and syr.vt, is not open to this objection.

39-40. Not in Mark, but there is a corresponding scene in Mt. xxi. 15-16 where the chief priests and scribes rebuke children who cried to Jesus in the temple "Hosanna to the Son of David."

39. τινες τῶν Φαρισαίων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου] We have not hitherto been prepared for the presence of Pharisees in the crowd. Syr.sin omits τῶν Φαρισαίων, and Wellh. thinks this is the true reading. But it is appropriate that the enthusiasm of the multitude should call forth an answering complaint from the standing enemies of Jesus.

40. ἐὰν σιωπήσουσι] For ἐάν c. indic. cf. 1 Thess. iii. 8, 1 Jo. v. 15, and see Moulton, *Prol.* pp. 168, 187.

41-44. Peculiar to Lk. The lament of Jesus over the city while he is surrounded by the shouting multitude makes a fine dramatic contrast. The tone of this passage, which is markedly different from that of xviii. 7, xix. 27 *supra*, is heard again in the words addressed to the women who followed him to crucifixion (xxii. 28f.)—another passage peculiar to Luke.

42 πόλιν ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτήν, λέγων ὅτι Εἰ ἔγνως ἐν τῇ
ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην— νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη
43 ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. ὅτι ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ
παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ ἐχθροί σου χάρακά σοι καὶ περι-
44 κυκλώσουσίν σε καὶ συνέξουσίν σε πάντοθεν, καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσίν
σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν λίθον ἐπὶ
λίθον ἐν σοί, ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς
45 σου. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν
46 τοὺς πωλοῦντας, λέγων αὐτοῖς Γέγραπται Καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἶκός
μου οἶκος προσευχῆς, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον
λῃστῶν.

47 Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· οἱ δὲ
ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι καὶ οἱ

42. τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην], 'the conditions—i.e. the relations with God—which make for thy peace.' This interpretation makes a contrast with the scene of war depicted in the next verse and therefore seems better than 'the conditions which make for peace with God' (so Klostermann). There is possibly a play on the name Jerusalem meaning ὅρασις εἰρήνης. Cf. Klostermann *ad loc.* ἐκρύβη] sc. τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην.

43-44. The siege is very clearly anticipated, as in xxi. 20 f. συνέξουσιν] A favourite Lucan word.

44. ἐδαφιοῦσιν] The word may mean 'to lay level with the ground' or 'to dash against the ground,' cf. Ps. cxxxvii. 9 ἐδαφιεῖ τὰ νήπιά σου πρὸς τὴν πέτραν, Hos. xiv. 1 τὰ ὑποτίτθια αὐτῶν ἐδαφισθήσονται. With the latter meaning the verb may govern both σε and τὰ τέκνα. Wellh., however, prefers to regard καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί as a separate clause co-ordinated, as in Semitic idiom, with the preceding: 'while thy children are within thee.'

τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου] Jesus visits the city as God's last messenger, but the city fails to recognise him.

45-46. On the omissions from Mk. before and after these verses see Introd. above.

46. γέγραπται . . . οἶκός προσευχῆς] Is. lvi. 7 ὁ γὰρ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Quoted by Mk. in full. Lk.'s omission of πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is probably deliberate. The Temple had fallen, and the nations were finding their way into the Church, not into the Temple of the old order.

47-48. The general statement that Jesus taught daily in the Temple is here interpolated by Lk. It has the effect of weakening the connexion between the cleansing of the Temple and the plot of the rulers. Contrast Mk. καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ ἐζήτουν κτλ., and cf. xx. 1 *infra* n.

47. οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς] Cf. Jos. *Ant.* xx. 10 fin. μετὰ δὲ τὴν [Ἡρῴδου καὶ Ἀρχελάου] τελευτὴν ἀριστοκρατία μὲν ἦν ἡ πολιτεία, τὴν δὲ προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπεπίστευντο.

πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ οὐχ ηὕρισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν, ὁ 48
λαὸς γὰρ ἅπας ἐξεκρέμετο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν 1 XX.
λαὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἀρχι-
ερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ εἶπαν 2
λέγοντες πρὸς αὐτόν Εἰπὸν ἡμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα
ποιεῖς, ἢ τίς ἐστιν ὁ δούς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην. 3
ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ
λόγον, καὶ εἴπατέ μοι Τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάνου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ 4
ἦν ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς 5
λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ Διὰ τί
οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, 6
ὁ λαὸς ἅπας καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς, πεπεισμένος γάρ ἐστιν

*καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ*] Add. Luc. The use of *πρῶτος* for a leader or chief is common in Lk. and Acts. Also Mk. vi. 21.

48. *καὶ οὐχ ηὕρισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσι*] Add. Luc. He thus prepares for the various devices to entrap Jesus which follow.

*ἐξεκρέμετο*]. Here only in N.T. Good Gk. from Thuc. downwards. Also Gen. xliv. 30 'hung upon him listening.' Mk. *πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.*

1. In Mk. the authority of Jesus is questioned by the members of the Sanhedrin on the day following the cleansing of the Temple, after Jesus has returned to Jerusalem from Bethany. *ταῦτα* Mk. xi. 28 (= Lk. xx. 2) refers in Mk. to the cleansing of the Temple. The connexion disappears here. The introduction to the paragraph is re-written in a vague sense, 'It came to pass on one of the days,' and by saying that Jesus was 'teaching in the Temple and preaching the Gospel' (Mk. *περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*) Lk. makes *ταῦτα* (*v.* 2) refer to the preaching of Jesus, not to his cleansing of the Temple.

2. *τίς ἐστιν ὁ δούς σοι ;*] 'who is he who gave you . . . ?' More idiomatic than Mk. *τίς σοι ἔδωκεν ;*

4. The counter-question as to the source and authority of John's Baptism (i.e. of his whole mission) is not a mere dialectical device (as the interpretative words in *vv.* 5, 6 might tempt the reader to suppose). If Jesus had been baptized by John and believed his preaching to the people to have been the preliminary to his own, it was right that he should require his critics to face the issue which John had already presented to them, before he consented to discuss the question of his own authority.

5. *συνελογίσαντο*] Class. Gk., Plut. etc., Inscrr., Papyri, LXX. Here only in N.T. *διελογίζοντο* Mk.

6. *ὁ λαὸς . . . ἡμᾶς*] So Lk. interprets their fears. Mk. simply *ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον.*

*πεπεισμένος γάρ . . . εἶναι*] A neatly turned Greek sentence. Mk. *ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάνην ὄντως ὅτι*

7 Ἰωάνην προφήτην εἶναι· καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι πόθεν.
8 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ

προφήτης ἦν. πείθω, πείθομαι are favourite words with Lk. Never in Mk. (except x. 24 πεποιθέναι ἐπί, 'to trust in').

7. μὴ εἰδέναι πόθεν] *Oratio obliqua.* Mk. οὐκ οἴδαμεν.

Bultmann, discussing the Marcan original of this paragraph (p. 9), thinks it probable that the association of this incident with the cleansing of the Temple is due to Mark and is not original. "The cleansing of the Temple does not seem appropriate as the occasion of a Rabbinic debate, such as that which we find here." But, he continues, the debate itself, as we have it, must have been transformed, for in order to conform to the type of a Rabbinic debate, the counter-question should itself give the reply to the original question. And this is actually the case here. Mk. xi. 30 contains the reply, and it is assumed on both sides that the authority of John is recognised. "As John had his authority from heaven, so also have I." This, B. holds, was misunderstood by some later narrator, who, starting from the presupposition that the hierarchs had not believed in John, made up the conclusion, *vv.* 31 f., to suit his presuppositions. Verses 28-30 are a genuine Palestinian *apophthegma*, but, in Bultmann's opinion, it is open to question whether the incident is a genuine historical narrative, or an imaginary creation of the early community. The community, he supposes, were faced by opponents (apparently the Jewish authorities, though this is not quite clear) who appealed to the Baptist and played off his claims against those of Jesus. This incident may be supposed to have been intended to turn this attack: if the enemies of the Christians recognised the authority of the Baptist, they ought also to recognise the authority of Jesus.

On the other hand it may be urged that we are obliged to start with the narrative as it stands, and the dialogue, as it stands, whether rabbinically correct or not, is very effective. No doubt the dilemma of the priests is interpreted from an outside point of view, i.e. it is assumed that the hierarchy had considered John's message and had rejected it. We may suppose that the real thoughts of the hierarchy would be somewhat as follows: if we allow John's authority to have been from heaven, we shall be obliged to allow that he had no more credentials than this man can shew us. That is a detail. The existing dialogue is a powerful and coherent whole. The point is not reached till Mk. xi. 33 (=Lk. *v.* 8), when Jesus refuses to answer. If we regard *v.* 33 as a secondary addition we are left with an intolerably lame reply, which would have had very little force either as a saying of the historical Jesus to the authorities at Jerusalem, or as a contribution to the controversy of the early Christian community which Bultmann, solely on the authority of this text, has imagined.

Moreover, it may be noted that the manner in which Jesus meets his antagonists is conceived in the same spirit as the subsequent controversy over the tribute money. In both cases Jesus maintains his own ground and refuses to play into the hands of his opponents. Bultmann (p. 12) sees no ground to doubt that the controversy over the tribute money is a genuine historical incident. The two

ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. Ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν 9
λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην Ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα,
καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν χρόνους
ἱκανούς. καὶ καιρῷ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς δοῦλον, 10
ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος δώσουσιν αὐτῷ· οἱ δὲ
γεωργοὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν δείραντες κενόν. καὶ προσέθετο 11
ἕτερον πέμψαι δοῦλον· οἱ δὲ κἀκεῖνον δείραντες καὶ
ἀτιμάσαντες ἐξαπέστειλαν κενόν. καὶ προσέθετο τρίτον 12
πέμψαι· οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τραυματίσαντες ἐξέβαλον. εἶπεν 13
δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος Τί ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν
μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἴσως τοῦτον ἐντραπήσονται. ἰδόντες 14

narratives seem to stand on much the same footing and may reasonably be supposed to come from the same stratum of tradition. Cf. Albertz, *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche*, pp. 23 f.

9. ἤρξατο δὲ . . . παραβολὴν ταύτην] Mk. καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν. Thus in Mk. Jesus continues to address the members of the Sanhedrin, but the presence of the people is assumed in Mk. too; see xii. 12. Here Jesus addresses the people, but the members of the Sanhedrin remain in the background. See *v.* 19 *infra*.

ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα] Founded on Is. v. 1 f. But Lk. has omitted the further details of the man's care for his vineyard, which Mk. has reproduced from Isaiah.

χρόνους ἱκανούς] Add. Luc. ἱκανός of time very freq. in Lk. and Acts; cf. also Ro. xv. 23. Not in the other Gospels. Classical.

10. ἵνα . . . δώσουσι] Cf. Blass, § 65. 2. ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν δείραντες κενόν] A participle (δείραντες) again replaces a principal vb. in Mk. Note also the double compound ἐξαπέστειλεν for Mk. ἀπέστειλεν. The verb ἐξαποστέλλω occurs Gal. iv. 4, 6. Otherwise peculiar to Lk. (*supra* xxiv. 49 and 7 times in Acts). In i. 53 (*Magnificat*) it is found again combined with κενός.

11-12. προσέθετο πέμψαι] A Hebraism, cf. Ju. iii. 12, iv. 1, x. 6 (LXX). Again in Acts xii. 3, and cf. xix. 11 *supra*. Lk. thus again gives a more definitely scriptural colouring to the language of his source. Mk. καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν.

11. In the account of the fate of the second servant Lk. has dropped the obscure Marcan word ἐκεφαλίωσαν and assimilated the language to the preceding verse.

12. In Mk. the third servant is killed. Lk. enhances the climax of the story—the murder of the son—by changing this into 'they wounded him and cast him out.' For a similar reason he drops Mk. *v.* 5b καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, οὓς μὲν δέροντες οὓς δὲ ἀποκτέννυντες.

13. Instead of recording the actual sending of the son, Lk. throws the whole into the form of a reflection on the part of the master of the vineyard, prefixed by the deliberative τί ποιήσω; for which cf. xii. 17, 18, xvi. 3. Mk. ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν, υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι Ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου.

τὸν ἀγαπητόν] Cf. iii. 22 n.

*δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες*
*Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα ἡμῶν*
15 *γένηται ἡ κληρονομία· καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ*
*ἀμπελῶνος ἀπέκτειναν. τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος*
16 *τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς*
*τούτους, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις. ἀκούσαντες δὲ*
17 *εἶπαν Μὴ γένοιτο. ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπεν Τί οὖν*
*ἐστὶν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο*

Λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμαϲαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντεϲ,
οὗτοϲ ἐγενήθη εἰϲ κεφαλὴν γωνίαϲ;

18 *πᾶς ὁ πεσὼν ἐπ᾽ ἐκεῖνον τὸν λίθον συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ᾽*

15. *καὶ ἐκβαλόντες . . . ἀπέκτειναν*] Mk. *καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος.* Both Mt. and Lk. reverse this order: the son is first cast out and then slain. We may probably see in this change a desire to assimilate the allegory more clearly to the circumstances of the death of Jesus, who suffered 'without the gate,' Heb. xiii. 12.

16. *ἀκούσαντες δὲ . . . ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπεν*] By inserting these words Lk. marks off the parable from the sayings which follow. The subject of *ἀκούσαντες* is *ὁ λαός* to whom the parable is addressed (*v.* 9). They pray that so terrible a fate may be averted from them. The effect of the parable upon the leaders is related below at *v.* 19.

17. The appended reference to the scripture (Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 22) introduces the thought of the divine vindication of the rejected son and heir. This could not be worked into the allegorical form of the preceding parable. Notwithstanding the rejection of the stone by the builders, it is placed as corner-stone; notwithstanding the rejection of the heir by the husbandmen, yet, when he is raised from the dead, he becomes ruler of God's inheritance. It appears from Acts iv. 11, 1 Pet. ii. 4-7 that this Psalm was in current use as a Messianic text in the primitive Church. In Justin, *Dial.* 34 *Λίθος* is one of the names for Christ. In 1 Pet. ii. 4 f. the verse from the Psalm is found in combination with two passages from Isaiah—viii. 14 'the stone of stumbling,' and xxviii. 16 'the precious corner-stone.' The two prophecies of Isaiah are found united in Ro. ix. 33; cf. Eph. ii. 20. It is probable that a combination of Is. viii. 14 with Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) lies behind the Lucan verse which follows.

18. Peculiar to Lk. In Mt. xxi. 44 the words are omitted by D. lat.vt syr.sin Orig, and in other texts no doubt represent an interpolation from Lk. The verse supplements the imagery of the exaltation of the Stone by the image of the Stone as an instrument of destruction, whether to those who fall against it or to those on whom it falls. The images are very confused and probably originate in scriptural texts dealing with the Stone, that is Christ. The first half of the verse is probably suggested by Is. viii. 14 (see preceding note) and the latter by Daniel ii. 44, where, in Theodotion (cf. Swete,

ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐζήτησαν 19
οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς
χεῖρας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαόν, ἔγνωσαν
γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην.
Καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐνκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους 20
ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὥστε
παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος.
καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Διδάσκαλε, οἴδαμεν ὅτι 21
ὀρθῶς λέγεις καὶ διδάσκεις καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον,

20 παρατηρησαντες] αποχωρησαντες D (υποχ. W) lat.vt go aeth: afterwards syr.vt: om syr.vg

*Introd. to O.T. in Greek*, pp. 47 f.), the word λικμήσει occurs: ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βασιλείαν . . . λεπτυνεῖ καὶ λικμήσει πάσας τὰς βασιλείας . . . ὃν τρόπον ἴδες ὅτι ἀπὸ ὄρους ἐτμήθη λίθος ἀνεὺ χειρῶν καὶ ἐλέπτυνεν τὸ ὄστρακον κτλ. The proper meaning of λικμᾶν is 'to winnow chaff from grain' and then derivatively 'to scatter as chaff,' 'to make to disappear.'

20. Lk. has entirely re-written the introduction to the question about the tribute money. Mk. says that "they (i.e. the chief priests and scribes) sent to him some of the Pharisees and Herodians to entrap him." Lk. has (1) made the motive of the question explicit: ὥστε παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγέμονος (this is to be compared with xxiii. 2, where, according to Lk., it was specifically alleged against Jesus by the Sanhedrin that he forbade to give tribute to Caesar); (2) he has suppressed the Pharisees and Herodians, and merely says that the questioners were suborned spies who 'pretended to be righteous.' (This was a natural inference from the language in *v.* 21.) The dilemma was very plain: if Jesus maintained that it was unlawful to pay the tribute, he made himself liable to the penalties of the Roman government; if he said that the payment was lawful, he would alienate popular support. It may well be that in fact Jesus did forfeit popularity when it was realised that he was not prepared to accept the position of a temporal sovereign, ruling over the theocracy. The question addressed to Jesus raised what had been the chief political issue in Palestine since the census of A.D. 6, and remained so until the downfall of the Jewish state in the war of 65–70. The answer of Jesus carries the implications (1) that man's relationship to God is established in its own right, and (2) that this relationship does not justify a repudiation of Caesar in his own sphere. When the idea of a distinction between the spheres of God and Caesar was transferred from the national Jewish Church to the Gentile world, it laid the axe at the root of the ancient conception of the state. Ranke speaks of these words of Jesus as being the most important and the most influential that he ever spoke. Ranke's judgement on the saying—characterized by Wellhausen as 'profane and somewhat perverse'—stands in notable conflict with the spirit of the saying itself.

22 *ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις· ἔξεστιν*
23 *ἡμᾶς* Καίσαρι *φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὔ; κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν*
24 *τὴν πανουργίαν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς* Δεῖξατέ *μοι δηνάριον·*
*τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν* Καίσαρος.
25 *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς* Τοίνυν *ἀπόδοτε τὰ* Καίσαρος
26 Καίσαρι *καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ. καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπι-
λαβέσθαι τοῦ ῥήματος ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ θαυμάσαντες
ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρίσει αὐτοῦ ἐσίγησαν.*

27 Προσελθόντες *δέ τινες τῶν* Σαδδουκαίων, *οἱ λέγοντες*
28 *ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες* Διδά-
*σκαλε,* Μωυσῆς *ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν,* ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ
*ἔχων γυναῖκα,* καὶ οὗτος ἄτεκνος ᾖ, *ἵνα* λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ
29 τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. *ἑπτὰ*
30 *οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα ἀπέθανεν*
31 *ἄτεκνος· καὶ ὁ δεύτερος καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν, ὡσαύτως*

23. *κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν*] Mk. *ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν.*

24. *Δεῖξατέ μοι δηνάριον*] Lk. omits from Mk. *ἵνα ἴδω* and leaves it to be inferred that the questioners brought the denarius (*οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν* Mk.). He also weakens the vivid question of Mk. *τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή;*

26. *καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι*] As they had set out to do, *v.* 20. The conclusion is expanded to answer the introduction. Mk. simply *καὶ ἐξεθαύμαζον ἐπ' αὐτῷ.*

*ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ*] Here, as generally in Lk., the people remain in the background of the scene.

27 f. Unlike the preceding questions the question of the Sadducees has no direct bearing on the personal position of Jesus and his relations with the authorities, Jewish and Roman. The question raised is of purely religious and theological importance. It may be conjectured that the question was a stock problem with which the conservative Sadducees were wont to oppose the doctrinal innovations which had been embraced by the Pharisees and had struck deep roots in the popular religion.

*προσελθόντες δέ τινες τῶν Σ., οἱ λέγοντες . . . ἐπηρώτησαν*] For Mk. *καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν, οἵτινες λέγουσι . . . καὶ ἐπηρώτων.*

28. *Διδάσκαλε*] The Sadducees approach Jesus with ironical courtesy.

*Μωυσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν*] Deut. xxv. 5. It is probable that the law of Levirate marriage was not practically in force in the first century. The question is raised in order to maintain the theological position that the law of Moses by implication excluded the belief in resurrection.

29. *ἑπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν*] 'Now there were seven brethren.' The conjunction *οὖν* is probably never found in the true text of Mk. Here, *v.* 15 *supra*, *vv.* 33, 44 *infra*, and elsewhere, Lk. eases the connexion by inserting the conjunction.

δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα καὶ ἀπέθανον· ὕστερον 32
καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν. ἡ γυνὴ οὖν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τίνος 33
αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνή; οἱ γὰρ ἑπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα.
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου 34
γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται, οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος 35
ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε
γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύναν- 36
ται, ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσιν, καὶ υἱοί εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως
υἱοὶ ὄντες. ὅτι δὲ ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ Μωυσῆς 37

34 *τουτου*] add *γεννωνται και γεννωσιν* D ff² i q: add *γεννωσι και γεννωνται* a c e l syr(vt.hl-mg) Iren Clem Orig Cypr Priscill Aug   *γαμουσι και γαμισκονται* om c e ff² i l q Cypr Aug

34. In Mk. Jesus begins by upbraiding the Sadducees: *οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ;* Lk. omits this, as he omits the final rebuke at *v.* 38. Jesus in Mk. then proceeds at once to the conditions of the resurrection. In Lk. he begins with stating positively the conditions in this world: "The sons of this age" (for this phrase cf. xvi. 8 *supra*) "marry and are given in marriage." Probably, however, we should read here *γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσι* (see crit. note). This would complete the argument, by bringing out the purpose of marriage, which is no longer required in the next world: *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται.*

35. *οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες . . . τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν*] Mk. simply *ὅταν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσι.* Here, as in xiv. 14, 'the resurrection of the just' is alone in question.

36. *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται*] Add. Luc. Cf. *v.* 34 n.

*ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσιν*] Mk. *ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι.* The mention of angels in a dispute with Sadducees will not be accidental, for the belief in angels was another part of the popular faith rejected by the Sadducees. Cf. Acts xxiii. 8. For the condition of the angels as requiring neither sustenance nor marriage cf. Enoch xv. 6 foll. (of the fallen angels): "But you were formerly spiritual, living the eternal life, and immortal for all generations of the world. And therefore I have not appointed wives for you; for as for the spiritual ones of the heaven, in heaven is their dwelling."

*καὶ υἱοί εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες*] This is added by Lk. *υἱοὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως* is a Semitism analogous to *υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* above. The meaning *καὶ υἱοί εἰσιν θεοῦ* in this connexion is less clear, unless it be regarded as an anticipation of the thought of the next section: the sons of the resurrection live unto God as their father; syr.sin omits.

37. Jesus now takes the offensive, and justifies belief in the resurrection from the common ground of the law. In Lk. Jesus says that Moses has 'indicated' or 'signified' (*ἐμήνυσεν*) that the dead are raised. This is perhaps felt to be a more appropriate manner of adducing an indirect argument than the direct appeal in Mk., "Have you not read in the book of Moses, how God said to him?" etc.

ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει Κύριον τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ
38 καὶ θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸν Ἰακώβ· θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νεκρῶν
39 ἀλλὰ ζώντων, πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν. ἀποκριθέντες δέ τινες
40 τῶν γραμματέων εἶπαν Διδάσκαλε, καλῶς εἶπας· οὐκέτι
41 γὰρ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτᾷν αὐτὸν οὐδέν. Εἶπεν δὲ

ὡς λέγει Κύριον κτλ.] 'when he speaks of the Lord as God of Abraham,' etc. Luke here, as again below, *v.* 42, substitutes a present (λέγει) for the Marcan aorist (εἶπεν). Luke's present tense is here a timeless present of what stands written in scripture. Cf. *infra*, *v.* 42, and Acts ii. 25, 34, vii. 48, viii. 34.

38. θεὸς δὲ . . . ζώντων] This is, as Wellh. remarks, the doctrine of both O. and N.T. But the inference which is drawn in the O.T. is that 'the dead praise not thee, O Lord, neither all they that go down to Sheol.'

πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν] This again is a Lucan addition. It finds an exact parallel in the strongly Hellenistic 4 Maccabees, where, as here, the Patriarchs are said to be 'alive to God': vii. 19 οἱ πιστεύοντες ὅτι θεῷ οὐκ ἀποθνήσκουσιν, ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ πατριάρχαι ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, Ἰακώβ, ἀλλὰ ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ: xvi. 25 ἔτι δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἰδόντες ὅτι διὰ τὸν θεὸν ἀποθανόντες ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ, ὥσπερ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ιακώβ, καὶ πάντες οἱ πατριάρχαι.

39. τινες τῶν γραμματέων] Thus Jesus has vindicated the popular belief in a future life, which was held by the Pharisees, and it is appropriate that he should receive commendation from some scribes who are present. We may compare the scene in Acts xxiii. 6 f., where Paul the Christian succeeds in enlisting the sympathy of the Pharisees against the Sadducees. But the present verse has been plainly suggested by the opening words of the Marcan paragraph recording the scribe's question as to the first commandment in the law, which Lk. has omitted at this point: καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συνζητούντων, εἰδὼς ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς κτλ. And *v.* 40 reproduces the last words of the omitted paragraph, Mk. xii. 34.

41-42. Mk. xii. 35-37. Jesus now himself presses home a question upon his opponents. Does not Scripture prove the Christ to be David's lord, not David's son, since David himself in the Psalms speaks of the Christ as his lord? The interpretation of the question is not easy. It seems clear that Jesus wishes to repudiate the conception that the Christ is David's son and heir. Perhaps there is an implied contrast of the Messianic son of David, who was expected to reign at Jerusalem, with the Messianic Son of Man, who sits—or stands (Acts vii. 56)—at the right hand of God in heaven. Ps. cx. was in current use as a Messianic text in the primitive Church; cf. Ac. ii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Heb. i. 13; 1 Pet. iii. 22. The suggestion that Jesus was appealing to Psalm cx. to rebut an objection that he was not of Davidic descent does not commend itself. The text gives no hint that such an objection was urged. Lk. himself has already insisted on the fact, generally accepted in the early Church (see Ro. i. 3), that Jesus was son of David. See i. 32, iii. 23 f. We can hardly suppose that he understood this passage to deny the fact. He probably took it to mean that the Christ, the son of David,

πρὸς αὐτούς Πῶς λέγουσιν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι Δαυεὶδ
υἱόν; αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυεὶδ λέγει ἐν Βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν 42

> Εἶπεν Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου
> ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου· 43

Δαυεὶδ οὖν αὐτὸν κύριον καλεῖ, καὶ πῶς αὐτοῦ υἱός ἐστιν; 44
Ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς 45
Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν 46
ἐν στολαῖς καὶ φιλούντων ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ
πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας
ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις, οἳ κατεσθίουσιν τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν 47
καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσεύχονται· οὗτοι λήμψονται

is entitled to an appellation more honourable than 'son of David.' Strack-Billerbeck, iv. 1, pp. 452-465 (*Excursus 18 on Psalm cx. in Old Rabbinic Literature*), shew that the Messianic interpretation of Psalm cx. is never found in Rabbinic literature until the second half of the third century. Prior to that date Rabbinic interpretation generally applied the Psalm to Abraham. The earliest of these non-Messianic interpretations is that of R. Ishmael, *c.* A.D. 100-135. When the Messianic interpretation begins to appear in Rabbinic literature towards the end of the third century A.D. it is as a new departure in exegesis. S.B. argue that the evidence of the N.T., especially of this passage (and parallels), may be taken to prove that a Messianic interpretation of the Psalm had been common ground to Jews and Christians in the first century, and that it is reasonable to conjecture that anti-Christian polemic led to the later predominance in rabbinic Judaism of a different exegesis.

41. πρὸς αὐτούς] The pronoun is vague. The assembled multitudes, including all parties, may be supposed to be included. Mk. ἔλεγεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. πῶς λέγουσι] Mk. gives οἱ γραμματεῖς as the subject. Lk. perhaps deliberately leaves the subject undefined: the Jews in general held that the Christ was son of David.

42. ἐν Βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν] Lk. is the only writer in the N.T. who refers to the Book of Psalms by its title. Cf. xxiv. 44; Ac. i. 20, xiii. 33. Mk. makes Jesus lay emphasis on the fact that David when he spoke was inspired: ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. On the present λέγει (Mk. εἶπεν) cf. *v.* 37 *supra* n.

45-xxi. 4. The long scene in the Temple now closes with a denunciation of the ostentation and pretence of the scribes, who, while they pray, devour the houses of widows, followed by the story of the poor widow who cast two mites into the treasury and exceeded the richest in her generosity. Both paragraphs come from Mk. with merely verbal modifications. The juxtaposition of the two paragraphs in Mk. is perhaps due to the reference to 'widows' in the denunciation of the scribes.

This denunciation of the scribes taken from Mk. is a shorter counterpart to the longer denunciation which Lk. introduced above (*c.* xi.)

*XXI. 1 περισσότερον κρίμα. Ἀναβλέψας δὲ εἶδεν τοὺς*
*βάλλοντας εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν πλουσίους.*
*2 εἶδεν δέ τινα χήραν πενιχρὰν βάλλουσαν ἐκεῖ λεπτὰ δύο,*
*3 καὶ εἶπεν Ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἡ πτωχὴ*
*4 πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν· πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος*
*αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος*
*αὐτῆς πάντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλεν.*

from Q. The Marcan denunciation was possibly excerpted from a longer context. Mt. has made this Marcan denunciation the occasion for a conglomeration of anti-Pharisaic polemics, as he has made the ensuing apocalyptic discourse of Mark the occasion of an apocalyptic conglomeration. Between the two great Matthaean discourses the story of the widow's mite has dropped out. It need not be doubted that it was contained in Mt.'s version of Mk. K. L. Schmidt's suggestion (*R.G.J.* p. 277) that the story may have been introduced later into Mk. from Lk. is not admissible. The style of the Marcan paragraph is characteristically Marcan. We have no reason to suppose that the process of literary embellishment and improvement of which Lk.'s narrative here as elsewhere *prima facie* gives proof was ever reversed.

## The Apocalyptic Discourse (xxi. 5-36)

Still following Mark, Luke concludes his account of the teaching and work of Jesus, during the last days before the arrest, with a long discourse on the approaching tribulations and the end of the world.

The various views which are held as to the origin and character of the Marcan discourse cannot be here discussed in detail. According to Wellhausen (*Ev. Marci*, pp. 100 f.) the discourse is a Christianised version of an original Jewish apocalypse, which Wellhausen thinks can be distinguished from the Christian interpolations. E. Meyer writes: "This whole proclamation has nothing to do with the historical Jesus. It is a creation of the first generation of the Christian community. That Jesus, like all the Old Testament prophets, spoke of the future and the approaching dissolution of earthly things and the establishment of the Kingdom of God is not to be doubted . . . but it is unlikely that he surrendered himself more deeply to the traditional conceptions, or that he occupied himself with eschatological pictures. The content of Mk. xiii. gives us the tradition as it took shape in the narrower circle of the leaders of the primitive community, and as it was put in the mouth of their Messiah on the ground of the expectations which they attached to him" (*Ursprung und Anfänge*, i. p. 129).

We are here more closely concerned with the modifications which Luke has introduced into the language and general scheme of the discourse. That he was in the main dependent upon Mark is not doubtful. As in Mark, the discourse may be divided into three main sections:

(1) *vv.* 8-19. The sufferings and trials of the faithful before the divine judgement arrives (|| Mk xiii. 5-13).

(2) *vv.* 20-28. The process of the divine judgement leading up to the coming of the Son of Man (|| Mk. xiii. 14-27).

(3) *vv.* 29-36. A warning to the disciples to be prepared (|| Mk. xiii. 28-37).

But though the main Marcan structure is preserved, there are notable differences which have led some critics (e.g. J. Weiss, also V. Taylor) to suspect the use of a separate source. But the changes in Luke seem in general to be explicable from certain general ideas and certain particular literary habits which, as the Gospel elsewhere testifies, influenced the procedure of the evangelist. In Mark there is no explicit reference to the fall of Jerusalem, and though that event *may* have taken place before the Marcan discourse assumed its present form, this is by no means certain, while the manner in which the distresses of 'those in Judaea' lead up to the return of the Son of Man make it probable that the discourse as a whole is prior to the fall of Jerusalem. (So Wellhausen and E. Meyer.) It seems clear, on the other hand, that for Luke the fall of Jerusalem is past history. The contemporary situation has made it necessary for Luke to impose an interpretation upon his source which will distinguish for his readers between fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecy. This accounts for the main changes in Luke, which are as follows:

(1) At *v.* 12 by the insertion of the words πρὸ δὲ τούτων the trials of the disciples described in *vv.* 12-19 are clearly distinguished from the final distresses and signs from heaven which are to usher in the end. Moreover, as Taylor notes, the drift of *vv.* 12 f. is discernibly different from the parallel in Mark. In Mark the dominant note is that of solemn warning, while in Luke the emphasis falls upon the certain triumph that is to attend the witness of Christ's disciples. Their adversaries will be unable to withstand the wisdom which shall be given them. Not a hair of their head shall perish. But the differences noted by Taylor do not seem to require the hypothesis of a special source, and against the hypothesis are the recurrent echoes of Mark. It does not seem likely that Luke would deliberately interpolate odd verses of Mark into another source, as Taylor supposes him to do, both here and elsewhere in the Gospel. The Lucan modifications are due to history. Verses 12-19 foretell the triumphant spread of the Gospel, which Luke is to record in Acts, and upon which he looks back as an accomplished triumph.

(2) The next section has been much more drastically edited. The 'abomination of desolation' standing where it ought not is replaced by 'Jerusalem encircled with armies.' The fall of Jerusalem fulfils prophecy and the consequent dispersion of the Jews introduces the next epoch, 'the times of the Gentiles' in which the evangelist and his readers live. Still in the future are the signs in sun, moon, and stars, and the final distresses which are the prelude to the return of the Son of Man when the redemption of the disciples is to draw near. As distinct from the completed judgement upon Jerusalem, this is to be a judgement upon the whole earth.

(3) The last paragraph expresses the central thought of the last paragraph in Mark, but there is little resemblance in language. It may come from another source, but more probably it is a free composition from the hand of the evangelist. Cf. *vv.* 34-36 note.

5 Καί τινων λεγόντων περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ὅτι λίθοις καλοῖς
6 καὶ ἀναθήμασιν κεκόσμηται, εἶπεν Ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε,
ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ
7 ὧδε ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται. ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγοντες
Διδάσκαλε, πότε οὖν ταῦτα ἔσται, καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον
8 ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Βλέπετε μὴ
πλανηθῆτε· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου
λέγοντες Ἐγώ εἰμι καί Ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν· μὴ πο-

5. *τινων λεγόντων*] In Mk. 'one of his disciples.' *ὅτι . . . κεκόσμηται*] The indirect statement replaces the graphic exclamation of Mk. *ἴδε ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί.* The correct language of Luke's paraphrase is illustrated by Paus. i. 5. 5 *ὁπόσα δὲ θεῶν ἱερὰ τὰ μὲν ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐπεκόσμησεν ἀναθήμασιν καὶ κατασκευαῖς*; 2 Macc. ix. 16 (of the Temple at Jerusalem) *ὃν δὲ πρότερον ἐσκύλευσεν ἅγιον νεὼ καλλίστοις ἀναθήμασιν κοσμήσειν.*

6. *ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε*] *Nom. pendens.* See Moulton, *Prol.* p. 69.

7. *ἐπηρώτησαν*] sc. the *τινες* referred to in *v.* 5. The scene is still the Temple. But in Mk. Jesus leaves the Temple and goes to the Mt. of Olives, where he delivers the discourse in answer to a question from Peter, James, John and Andrew. Perhaps Lk. recalls that an answer to this question has already been given to the disciples, xvii. 22 f. *ταῦτα*] This must refer to the destruction of the Temple as in Mk. xiii. 4. But the discourse which follows refers to the question by implication only (*v.* 24) in Lk., and in Mk. not at all; cf. Wellh. *Ev. Marci*, p. 100. Wellh. thinks that the incident, Mk. xiii. 1-2 (= Lk. *vv.* 5-6), is authentic reminiscence, and that it has been made into the occasion of the apocalyptic prophecy, which had a different origin.

8. *καί Ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν*] Add. Luc., who thus makes Jesus warn his

ρευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ 9
ἀκαταστασίας, μὴ πτοηθῆτε· δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι
πρῶτον, ἀλλ’ οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος. Τότε ἔλεγεν αὐ- 10
τοῖς Ἐγερθήσεται ἔθνος ἐπ’ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν,
σεισμοί τε μεγάλοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ 11
ἔσονται, φόβηθρά τε καὶ ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα
ἔσται. πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς τὰς 12
χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ διώξουσιν, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συν-
αγωγὰς καὶ φυλακάς, ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγε-
μόνας ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου· ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς 13
μαρτύριον. θέτε οὖν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν μὴ προμελετᾷν 14

hearers not only against false Messiahs (or false teachers?), but also apparently against all preaching of the near approach of the end. This is no longer the perspective of the first generation.

9. *ἀκαταστασίας*] Mk. *ἀκοὰς πολέμων*. *ἀκαταστασία* is not unusual in Gk. historians for a civil commotion. Cf. Wettstein *ad loc.* Perhaps Lk. had in mind the civil wars and the rapid succession of emperors between the death of Nero and the accession of the Flavian dynasty, 68–70.

10. *τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*] Inserted by Lk. (om. D syr.vt). The formula marks a transition from the warnings of *vv.* 8-9 to the definitely prophetic passage which follows. For a similar formula of transition cf. *v.* 29.

11. *λοιμοὶ καί*] Add. Luc. The assonance *λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοί* is familiar in Gk. lit., Hesiod, *W. and D.* 243 *λιμὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ λοιμόν*: cf. Thuc. ii. 54. *φόβηθρά τε . . . μεγάλα ἔσται*] Add. Luc. Lk. intends this verse to describe the portents which are to usher in the end. Cf. *v.* 25, which should be regarded as resuming the theme of this verse. Lk. dissociates these portents from the more immediate sufferings which the disciples are to undergo (*vv.* 12-19) by the insertion of *πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων* in the next verse.

12. *καὶ φυλακάς*] Not in Mk. The imprisonments of Peter and the other disciples recorded in Acts are perhaps in mind. *ἀπαγομένους* must agree with *ὑμᾶς*. The construction is very awkward.

13. *ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον*] Mk. *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*, i.e. for a testimony to the kings and rulers. Lk.'s paraphrase gives a somewhat different turn to the thought: the dangers encountered by the preachers will be overruled to become opportunities of witness to the Gospel. Mk. xiii. 10 'the Gospel must first be preached to all nations' goes out. Lk. indicates the triumphant progress of the Gospel, but this is not with him the prelude to the end (Mk. *πρῶτον*).

14. *μὴ προμελετᾷν ἀπολογηθῆναι*] The injunction throws into relief the gulf between Christian speech and the rhetorical standards of the day. Cf. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, p. 455. But Lk.'s paraphrase of Mk. shews him to have some acquaintance with the methods of defence which Christians are to eschew: *προμελετᾷν* (here

15 ἀπολογηθῆναι, ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν ᾗ οὐ
δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι ἢ ἀντειπεῖν ἅπαντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι
16 ὑμῖν. παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν
17 καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, καὶ
18 ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. καὶ
19 θρὶξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται. ἐν τῇ ὑπο-
20 μονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε
κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἰερουσαλήμ, τότε γνῶτε
21 ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ
φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρείτω-
σαν, καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν,
22 ὅτι ἩΜΈΡΑΙ ἘΚΔΙΚΉϹΕΩϹ αὗταί εἰσιν τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα

19 κτησεσθε ABΘ 124-13 33 al pauc latt syrr arm aegg Orig Tert: κτησασθε ℵDL al pler d i Bas al ς

only in the Gk. Bible; not quoted from papyri by M.M.) is the proper term for preparing a speech. Cf. Aristoph. *Ecclesiaz.* 116 ὅπως προμελετήσαιμεν ἁκεῖ δεῖ λέγειν.

15. Add. Luc. Again Lk. emphasises the triumph of the heavenly wisdom in spite of antagonism. Cf. Ac. vi. 10.

16-17. A paraphrase of Mk. xiii. 12, 13a in which the quotation from Micah vi. disappears. The treachery of 'friends' is an additional point not found in Mk.

18. Add. Luc. This is somewhat remarkable after θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν above. Probably Lk. intends it to be interpreted of the ultimate safety of faithful 'martyrs.' It strengthens the optimistic note which runs through these verses. For the proverbial form of expression cf. xii. 7 (=Mt. x. 30); Ac. xxvii. 34; 1 Regn. xiv. 45.

19. Mk. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται, where the thought is eschatologically conditioned. Not so the Lucan text which seems to continue the thought of the preceding verse: by their patient endurance of persecution, the disciples will win their souls for eternity.

20. ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε] The opening words of this paragraph are identical with Mk. xiii. 14, and the Marcan source reappears at *vv.* 21a and 23, but for the Marcan citation from Dan. xii. 11, ix. 27 ('the abomination of desolation') Lk. substitutes the siege of Jerusalem, and whereas Mk. at *v.* 14 begins the picture of 'the end,' Lk. has disconnected the events of the siege from the coming of the Son of Man.

21. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ . . . ὄρη] From Mk. xiii. 14. The two following verses in Mk. ('he that is on the housetop' and 'he that is in the field') are omitted. Their substance has already been given in xvii. 31. Lk. xxi. 21b, 22 are not in Mk.

ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς . . . εἰς αὐτήν] i.e. Jerusalem, referring back to *v.* 20. It is probable that the verses echo the retreat of the Christians from Jerusalem to Pella in Peraea before the siege—κατά τινα χρησμὸν δι' ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκδοθέντα, Eus. *H.E.* iii. 5. 3.

τὰ γεγραμμένα. οὐαὶ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς 23
θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις· ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη
μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὀργὴ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, καὶ πεσοῦνται 24
στόματι μαχαίρης καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη
πάντα, καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι οὗ
πληρωθῶσιν [καὶ ἔσονται] καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. καὶ ἔσονται 25
σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἤχους θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου, ἀποψυχόντων 26
ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν
ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, αἱ γὰρ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν
σαλευθήσονται. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου 27
ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.
Ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς 28

24 *καιροι εθνων*] praem *και εσονται* B: praem *καιροι και εσονται* L syr.hl-mg boh: om D 25 *ηχους* ℵABCLΘ 1 etc 69 etc latt syrr aegg arm Tert: *ηχουσης* D al pler Eus ς

23. *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*] i.e. Palestine, not, as in *v.* 35, the whole earth.

24. *πεσοῦνται . . . καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται*] Acc. to Jos. *B.J.* vi. 9. 3, 1,100,000 were slain during the siege, and 97,000 taken prisoners in the course of the war. *αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι* not infrequent in LXX. Disapproved by Phryn. ccccvii. *αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι· τοῦθ᾽ οὕτως ἀδόκιμον ὥς μηδὲ Μένανδρον αὐτῷ χρήσασθαι. διαλύων οὖν λέγε αἰχμάλωτον γενέσθαι.*

*ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν*] The meaning seems to be that the Gentiles have a fixed period during which they will be allowed to lord it over Jerusalem. Cf. Ezek. xxx. 3. Lk. may also include the thought of Ro. xi. 25: 'the times of the Gentiles' are the times of their opportunity to enter the kingdom. The verse would then give an equivalent to Mk. xiii. 10 omitted above. For the phrase cf. Tobit xiv. 5 (B) *ἕως πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος.*

25-26. There are reminiscences of Mk. xiii. 24-25, but Mk.'s prophetic quotations are abbreviated. Luke notes the terror and perplexity of the nations. The roaring of the sea is not paralleled in Mk. Cf. Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 8 *ὁ συνταράσσων τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης, ἤχους κυμάτων αὐτῆς. ταραχθήσονται τὰ ἔθνη καὶ φοβηθήσονται οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὰ πέρατα ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων σου.*

26. *ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*] As distinct from the special judgement upon Jerusalem, this is to be a judgement upon the whole earth.

27-28. *καὶ τότε κτλ.*] Then at last the nations shall see the Son of Man return in power and glory. The converse to the judgement of the earth is the redemption of the elect. *ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις* here only in the Gospels, but 7 times in Paul. Here the *ἀπολύτρωσις* is not associated with the death of Christ but with his return. This is, as Wellh. remarks, the earlier conception.

29 *κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν, διότι ἐγγίζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.* Καὶ
*εἶπεν παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς* Ἴδετε *τὴν συκῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ*
30 *δένδρα· ὅταν προβάλωσιν ἤδη, βλέποντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν*
31 *γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤδη ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν· οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς,*
*ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἡ*
32 *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ*
33 *ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ἕως* [*ἂν*] *πάντα γένηται. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ*
*γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται.*
34 Π*ροσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς μή ποτε βαρηθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν*
*ἐν κρεπάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς, καὶ ἐπιστῇ*
35 *ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ὡς* παγίς· *ἐπεισελεύσεται*

28 *εγγιζει*] *ηγγικεν* 1 etc l m syrr sah Hipp Tert 34, 35 *η ημερα εκεινη ως παγις· επεισελευσεται γαρ* ℵBDL 157 lat.vt aegg Tert et ut vid Method Cyr: *η ημερα εκεινη· ως παγ. γαρ επ.* AC al pler vg syrr arm Eus Bas Iren (lat) ς

29. *καὶ εἶπεν παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς*] Lk. again marks a transition by inserting this introductory phrase. Cf. *v.* 10 *supra*. Mk. *ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν.*

*καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα*] Add. Luc., who thus shews that he understands *συκῆ* in his source as representative of trees in general.

30. *προβάλωσιν*] sc. *τὰ φύλλα.* Mk. *ὅταν ἤδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς ἁπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύῃ τὰ φύλλα.* Cf. Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 19 *ἂν καρπὸν προβάλῃ τὰ φυτά.* The omission here of the object is unusual. It has been supplied in D lat.vt syr.vt *τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν.*

31. *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*] The subject is added by Lk. for greater clearness. The coming of the kingdom of God will as certainly follow the tribulations as summer follows the sprouting of the trees.

32, 33 = Mk. *vv.* 30, 31. But it is not very clear how Lk. intends *v.* 32 to be interpreted. Perhaps of the fall of Jerusalem (Klostermann). Lk. omits Mk. *v.* 32 (that neither the angels nor the Son know when that day shall be)—perhaps because he did not care to affirm the ignorance of the Son. In Acts i. 7 we read that it is not for the apostles to know times or seasons 'which the Father has put in his own power'; the knowledge of the Son is not affirmed, but it is not denied.

34-36. The discourse ends, as in Mk., with an injunction to watchfulness, but the paragraph has been re-written. The parable of the man who went on a journey to a far country and gave authority to his servants is left out, probably because Luke regarded it as a variant of xii. 35 f., and a general exhortation to watchfulness and prayer takes its place. The verses contain a large proportion of favourite Lucan words and phrases: *προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς, ἐπιστῇ, ἐπεισελεύσεται* (here only in N.T., but *ἐπέρχεσθαι* is a favourite Lucan word and Lk. likes compounds), *ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς* (cf. Acts xvii. 26 *κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς*), *δεόμενοι* (8 times in Gospel, 7 times in Acts, in other Gospels only Mt. ix. 38).

γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺϲ καθημένουϲ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆϲ γῆϲ.
ἀγρυπνεῖτε δὲ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι ἵνα κατισχύσητε 36
ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, καὶ σταθῆναι
ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, τὰς δὲ νύκτας 37
ἐξερχόμενος ηὐλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν·
καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὤρθριζεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν 38
αὐτοῦ.

38 post hunc versum habent 69 etc pericopen de adultera (Jo vii 53-viii 11)

35. The universality of the final judgement is emphasised, as compared with the previous judgement upon Jerusalem. The wording seems to be an echo of Is. xxiv. 17 φόβος καὶ βόθυνος καὶ παγὶς ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

37-38. Peculiar to Lk. Cf. xix. 47. An editorial summary which replaces the omission of several journeys to and from Jerusalem recorded or implied in Mk. for these last days. In Mk. xi. 11 he goes out to Bethany. No place is specified at xi. 19, but at xiv. 3 he is at Bethany again. The apocalyptic discourse in Mk. is delivered on the Mt. of Olives. Bethany was near to the Mt. of Olives. Mk. xi. 1 = Lk. xix. 29. αὐλίζεσθαι need not mean a night spent in the open air. Cf. Mt. xxi. 17; Did. xi. 6.

38. ὤρθριζεν] Here only in N.T., but frequent in LXX for the class. ὀρθρεύω.

The insertion of the *pericope de adultera* (Jo. vii. 53-viii. 11) at this point in the ancestor of the Ferrar group was no doubt suggested by the parallel between the situation implied in [Jo.] viii. 1, 2 with that described here.

## The Conspiracy of the Chief Priests and the Treachery of Judas
## (xxii. 1-6)

Luke closely follows Mark xiv. 1-2, 10-11. The intervening narrative of the anointing in the house of Simon the Leper (Mk. xiv. 3-9) is omitted. It breaks the sequence of the narrative at this point, and Luke has an alternative version of an anointing by a woman which he has inserted in an earlier context, c. vii.

ΗΓΓΙΖΕΝ δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη Πά- 1 XXII

1. ἤγγιζεν δὲ . . . Πάσχα] Mk. ἦν δὲ τὸ Πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας. It is not strictly correct to identify the feast of unleavened bread with the Passover. The seven days of unleavened bread were reckoned from 15th to 21st Nisan (Lev. xxiii. 5-6). The Passover was killed on the afternoon of 14th Nisan and eaten the same night, i.e., according to Jewish reckoning, at the beginning of 15th Nisan. (Cf. Buchanan Gray, *Sacrifice in O.T.* pp. 337 f.) Jos. *Ant.* iii. 10. 5 distinguishes the two feasts, πέμπτη δὲ καὶ δεκάτη διαδέχεται τὴν τοῦ Πάσχα ἡ τῶν

2 σχα. Καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὸ πῶς
3 ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν, ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν. Εἰσ-
ῆλθεν δὲ Σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην,
4 ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα· καὶ ἀπελθὼν συνελάλη-
σεν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ στρατηγοῖς τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῷ
5 αὐτόν. καὶ ἐχάρησαν καὶ συνέθεντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι.
6 καὶ ἐξωμολόγησεν, καὶ ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι
αὐτὸν ἄτερ ὄχλου αὐτοῖς.

4 τοις αρχιερευσιν] add και τοις γραμματευσιν C 700 al pauc lat.vt syrr arm boh (codd) Eus     και στρατηγοις om D lat.vt syr.vt aeth

ἀζύμων ἑορτή, but in xiv. 2. 1 he can write κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτῆς, ἣν Φάσκα λέγομεν.

2. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς] The rulers of Jerusalem, under the Roman Procurator. Jos. *Ant.* xx. 10 fin. μετὰ δὲ τὴν [Ἡρῴδου καὶ Ἀρχελάου] τελευτὴν ἀριστοκρατία μὲν ἦν ἡ πολιτεία, τὴν δὲ προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπεπίστευντο.

τὸ πῶς . . . ] Art. prefixed to indirect question almost confined to Lk. in N.T. Cf. i. 62, xix. 48, xxii. 4, 23. Also Ro. viii. 26; 1 Thess. iv. 1. See Blass, § 47. 5. Lk. omits Mk. xiv. 2 ἔλεγον γὰρ μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μήποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ, prob. in order to avoid the discrepancy with the subsequent narrative, according to which Jesus is arrested on the night of the feast.

3. εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν] The prince of evil, who had been foiled in his previous attempts upon the Son of God, now makes Judas his instrument to compass his death. Satan is not mentioned in this connexion in Mk. But cf. Jo. xiii. 2 τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτης, and Jo. xiii. 27. In 1 Cor. ii. 8 it is the evil spirits who brought about the crucifixion.

4. καὶ στρατηγοῖς] i.e. the commanders of the Temple police referred to again *v.* 52. Cf. Acts iv. 1, v. 24, 26 ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ. See Schürer, ii. pp. 321 f. They are not mentioned in Mk. or Mt. The omission of the words here in D is prob. due to assimilation to the text of the other Gospels, and the substitution of καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσιν in syr.vt. lat.vt to the influence of *v.* 2.

6. καὶ ἐξωμολόγησεν and ἄτερ ὄχλου are explanatory additions by Lk. ἄτερ in Gk. Bible only here, *v.* 35 *infra*, and 2 Macc. xii. 15; found occas. in Gk. prose and in papyri. See M.M. *s.v.*

εὐκαιρίαν] So both Mt. and Lk. for πῶς εὐκαίρως Mk.

## THE LAST SUPPER (xxii. 7-38)

The sayings and actions of Jesus at the Last Supper which he shared with his disciples on the night in which he was betrayed entered into the common tradition of the Christian churches from an early date. The account given by Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23 f.), and that embodied in Mk. xiv., though differing in important details and independent the one of the other, are yet in substantial agreement. Matthew depends upon and closely follows Mark. According to both Mark and Paul, Jesus distributed bread and wine as symbols of his body and his blood, and used words which implied a sacrificial interpretation of his approaching death. Mark and Paul also agree in giving the idea of an eschatological counterpart to the Supper. In Mark xiv. 25 Jesus says: "Verily I say unto you that I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." There is no parallel to this in 1 Cor., but the eschatological idea is implied when it is said that the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup—which, according to Paul, is continued in the Church in obedience to an express command of Jesus at the Supper,—is a proclamation of the Lord's death 'till he come.' Nothing in 1 Cor. suggests that the Last Supper was a Passover. The Marcan narrative as a whole implies that the Last Supper was a Passover, but it is not consistent with itself, and in the actual account of the Supper distinctively paschal features are absent. It is possible that both Paul and the narrative embodied in Mark represent a tradition according to which, as in John, the Last Supper antedated the Passover. Reasons for thinking that the Johannine tradition corresponds with historical fact are given by Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, pp. 130 f.; E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, i. pp. 173 f.; Burkitt, *J.Th.S.* xvii. (1916), pp. 291 f.

The Lucan version of the Supper is undoubtedly dependent upon the Marcan. The account of the preparation for the meal is taken from Mark entire, and at *vv.* 18, 19, 22 unmistakable reminiscences of Mark are found. But Luke has painted the whole scene afresh. The following are the principal points which distinguish the Lucan version from the Marcan:

(1) The conception of the Last Supper as a Passover is consistently carried through. The discrepant verse, Mark xiv. 2, is omitted, and the Supper opens with a saying by Jesus that he had earnestly desired to eat that Passover before he suffered.

(2) The cup is blessed and handed round before, instead of after, the bread, and the words spoken in connexion with the cup differ considerably from those in Mark. There is no mention of 'the blood of the covenant.'

(3) The drinking of the cup and the breaking of the bread are recorded at the beginning of the narrative, before, instead of after, the prophecy of the treachery of Judas.

(4) The account of the Supper is greatly expanded by the inclusion of teachings and sayings of Jesus partly paralleled elsewhere in the Synoptics, partly peculiar to Luke.

(5) The prophecy of the denial of Peter is transferred from the journey to Gethsemane to the Supper, as in St. John.

It has been held by some critics (Perry, Streeter, Taylor) that the divergences from Mark here and in the rest of the Passion narrative are to be explained from a special source which Luke has mainly followed in preference to Mark. It is maintained in the notes that the Lucan text does not, on the whole, support the hypothesis of a second continuous narrative source. Luke has himself freely rewritten, re-arranged, and enlarged St. Mark. He may sometimes preserve independent traditions, but the continuous thread of his narrative appears to be based upon Mark.

If this hypothesis is well founded, the peculiarities of the Lucan narrative of the Last Supper, and particularly of the distribution of the bread and wine, do not directly reflect a primitive source. None the less they are highly significant as shewing the kind of modification in the presentation of the Supper which was still possible for an educated and skilful writer in the later decades of the first century. Luke could scarcely have described the Supper as he does, if he had thought of the Eucharist on Pauline lines as a proclamation of the death of Christ according to a rite instituted by Jesus at the Last Supper. And there are other indications that he did not do so: the disciples at Emmaus (*c*. xxiv.) had not been at the Last Supper, yet they recognise Jesus in 'the breaking of the bread.' The action was presumably characteristic and followed a familiar form. It is this custom which is perpetuated in the earliest Church as pictured in Acts (ii. 42,46). The Last Supper falls into place with the other occasions of 'breaking bread,' but it does not originate the rite. This probably reflects the actual course of development. Luke writes in an age when Christian rites and institutions are still in a fluid state. No fixed interpretation has yet become normative. That this was so at the close of the first century is supported by other evidence: the *Didache* can give forms of blessing for the cup and the bread (in the Lucan order) and thanksgiving after the Eucharist without an allusion to the Last Supper or to the death of Christ; St. John can record the Last Supper without any mention of the bread and wine and attach his eucharistic teaching to the feeding of the multitude. However, as the Pauline conception of the Eucharist tended to become normative, the Lucan account of the Last Supper must have been felt to be defective and anomalous. It was in consequence already by the middle of the second century, as it seems (Justin, *Apol*. i. 66), supplemented by an interpolation from 1 Cor.

The Lucan picture of the Supper represents a natural tendency to group together especially characteristic teachings of Jesus in the account of his last meal with his disciples. It is the same tendency which is carried a stage further in St. John, where the Last Supper is the occasion of long and intimate discourses of Jesus with his own before his presence is withdrawn.

Ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ 7
πάσχα· καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην εἰπών Πο- 8
ρευθέντες ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα ἵνα φάγωμεν. οἱ δὲ 9
εἶπαν αὐτῷ Ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐ- 10
τοῖς Ἰδοὺ εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσει
ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε
αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπορεύεται. καὶ ἐρεῖτε τῷ οἰκο- 11
δεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος Ποῦ ἐστὶν
τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω;
κἀκεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἑτοι- 12
μάσατε. ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς, καὶ 13
ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, 14
ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς 15

14 *οι αποστολοι* ℵ*BD 157 a b c e ff$^2$ i l syr.vt sah: *οι δωδεκα* ℵ$^{ca}$ LX 6 ev (cf. Mt et Mc): *οι δωδεκα αποστολοι* ℵ$^{cb}$ AC al pler f q vg syrr(vg.hl) boh ϛ

7-12. With slight changes the account of the preparations for the Passover follows Mk. xiv. 12-16.

7. Following Mk. xiv. 7 *καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον*. Technically this is not correct. 14th Nisan was not properly one of 'the days of unleavened bread.' See *v.* 1 n. But Rabbinic authority is found for reckoning in 14th Nisan (Machilta, Ex. xii. 15 in S.B. ii. p. 813; see Excursus in Klostermann on Mk. xi. 1), and Jos. *B.J.* v. 3. 1 speaks of the feast of unleavened bread as beginning on 14th Nisan.

8. *Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην*] The two disciples are not named in Mk. Peter and John are found together again in Acts iii. 1 f., viii. 14. In Mk. the two disciples are dispatched in response to an enquiry of the disciples as to where they are to prepare the Passover. In Lk. Jesus takes the initiative.

10. Lk. adds *Ἰδού*, for the imperat. *ὑπάγετε* substitutes a gen. absol., and for *ἀπαντήσει* gives *συναντήσει* (five times in Lk.-Ac., and Heb. vii. 1, 10).

14. *καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα*] A solemn introduction to the narrative of the Supper. Mk. *καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης*.

*καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι*] *μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα* Mk. Cf. vii. 13 n. The use of the title suits the solemnity of the occasion. The addition of *δώδεκα* will be due to assimilation to the text of the other Gospels.

15-20. The case for regarding *vv.* 19b-20 as no part of the original text is convincingly stated by Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, pp. 63 f. The different textual variations can all be explained as attempts to bring the text of D etc. into line with

αὐτούς Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν
16 μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ

the other Gospels and Paul: (i.) *b e* syr.vt transpose 19a to precede the cup, thus making the order, bread—wine, conform to the other texts. (ii.) The text of ℵB and all Gk. MSS. except D has added *vv.* 19b-20 (agreeing in the main with 1 Cor. xi.). This longer text appears to have been already known in the time of Justin, and perhaps dates from the formation of the official Canon (cf. Burkitt, *J.Th.S.* xxviii. p. 181). (iii.) The Peshitto read the longer text and omits the peculiar Lucan *vv.* 17, 18. The text of the Old Syriac presents a complicated problem, arising out of differences (not recorded in my critical note) between the Curetonian and Sinaitic. The texts are discussed by Burkitt, *Ev. da Meph.* ii. pp. 300 f., who concludes that there is "no indication that either Sinaitic or Curetonian is based on the longer Greek text." It has been further argued that 19a *καὶ λαβὼν . . . σῶμά μου* should also be regarded as an interpolation (so Blass, Wellhausen, E. Meyer; Lietzmann, *Messe u. Herrenmahl*, p. 216, n. 3, withdraws his support), and the different position of the words in *b e* from that in other texts is urged against the originality of the text of D and its Old Latin allies (H. N. Bate, *J.Th.S.* xxviii. p. 366). The omission of these words would effect a great simplification in the narrative. We should then have two parallel sayings referring (1) to the eating of the Paschal victim; (2) to the drinking of the wine, in each case with an anticipation of the 'fulfilment' of the Passover in the coming kingdom. There would be no allusion to the bread as representing the body of Christ, or to the wine as his blood. "The action in Luke shews no trace of fixed liturgical form; it is purely historical, the last Passover meal" (Wellh.). 19a undoubtedly makes an awkward and abrupt conclusion to the verses preceding, but the case for its rejection seems not to have been made out: (1) the words are attested by all MSS. and versions; (2) the desire to assimilate the order to the other texts sufficiently accounts for the position of the words in syr.vt *b e*; (3) Luke made use of Mk., and Mk. contains the words. If 'the breaking of bread' at the Last Supper was referred to in his source, he would be unlikely entirely to omit it (cf. ix. 16, xxiv. 30, 35; Ac. ii. 42, 46, xx. 7, 11). K. L. Schmidt, art. 'Abendmahl' in *Rel. in Gesch. u. Gegenwart*, i. (1927), col. 7, holds that *v.* 17 should also be regarded as an interpolation. There is no support for this in the textual evidence, and the omission of *v.* 17 would leave an impossible sequence between *v.* 16 and *v.* 18. We conclude, then, that the text of D etc. represents the original text of Luke.

It seems not impossible to suggest an explanation for the awkwardness of *v.* 19a as it stands, if we take into account both the Marcan text on which Luke was working, and the intention which we may presume him to have entertained, of enhancing the Paschal character of the supper. The Marcan account of the preparations for the supper clearly assumes the supper to be the Passover, but in the Marcan account of the supper itself, as in the closely similar narrative of 1 Cor. xi., there are no distinctively Paschal features; indeed the use of ἄρτος is most naturally μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ

16 πληρωθη] καινον βρωθη D

accounted for, if the narratives did not originally describe the Paschal meal. Luke follows his Marcan source in regarding the supper as the Passover, and gives a definitely Paschal colouring to the supper itself which is lacking in Mark. The dominant idea in the Lucan account is that Jesus celebrates the chief rite of the old dispensation for the last time, at the same time looking forward to its consummation in the kingdom of God (*vv.* 16, 18, 30). An outstanding feature of the Lucan narrative is the parallelism in wording and in idea between *vv.* 15-16 and *vv.* 17-18. But the wording of *v.* 18 is so close to Mk. xiv. 25 that it may be assumed to be derived from Mk. The solemn and ceremonial drinking of cups of wine was a regular part of the Paschal feast. The drinking of a cup of wine is also related in Mk.'s account of the supper. This is therefore naturally taken over by Lk., who, however, drops the sacrificial language of Mk., "the blood of the Covenant, which is poured out for many." This was not a thought associated with the wine at the Passover. Perhaps it was not entirely congenial to Lk. himself (cf. Mk. x. 45, 'a ransom for many'—a passage which is likewise omitted in Luke's Gospel), and the evidence of the *Didache* proves that the sacrificial idea did not always attach to the wine at the Eucharist. The preceding verses concerning the desire of Jesus to eat the Passover have been framed on the model of the words over the cup (derived from Mk.) to provide a Paschal introduction to the scene as a whole. The distribution of the bread is now left over. It does not easily fit into an account of a Paschal meal. But it is a part of the tradition which Lk. would be unwilling to disturb, and it is therefore allowed to follow the sayings about the Paschal meal and the wine. Thus the wine is given before the bread.

According to St. Paul, Jesus blessed the cup 'after supper,' and this probably corresponded to the usage with which Paul was familiar in gatherings of the Church. But that it was not universal is shewn by the *Didache*, where the blessing of the cup precedes the blessing of the bread (cf. also 1 Cor. x. 15-16). Luke may therefore have been conscious that in changing the order he had support in some current usage.

15, 16. The meaning is that Jesus had earnestly desired to eat this passover, and that his desire is fulfilled. The words in themselves might mean that Jesus had *desired* to eat the *approaching* passover, but he knew that, before it came, he would die. This latter interpretation is advocated by Burkitt and Brooke (*J.Th.S.* ix. (1908) pp. 569-572), who hold that the saying is thus in line with the tradition that the Last Supper was not the Passover. It is suggested in the preceding note that the words were probably written to stand in their present setting. If this is so, the usual interpretation, to which indeed there seems no objection, is demanded. (See *vv.* 8, 13.) The idea expressed by ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν in *v.* 18 must be supplied with οὐ μὴ φάγω.

15. ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα] A Hebraism. Cf. Ac. v. 28 παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν. Blass, § 38. 3.

πληρωθῇ] The Passover is a type

17 *θεοῦ. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν Λάβετε*
18 *τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ*
*πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ*
19 *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας*
*ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά*
*μου* [*τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν*
20 *ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι,*
*λέγων Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ* ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ *ἐν τῷ* ΑἽΜΑΤΙ
21 *μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*]. *πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ*

17, 18 hos vv om syr.vg: habet post *v.* 19 syr.vt: habent post 19 a (*σωμα μου*) b e     *εις εαυτους*] add this is my blood, the new covenant syr.sin     19, 20 *το υπερ υμων διδομενον . . . εκχυννομενον* om D a b e ff$^{2}$ i l: *και το ποτηριον . . . εκχυννομενον* om syr.vt

or prophecy of the Messianic banquet. The reading of D (preferred by Wellh.) is probably an echo of Mk. xiv. 25.

17. It is hard to decide whether Lk. intends the cup to be understood in a purely historical sense of the Paschal cup (so Wellh.). Probably a forward reference to the Eucharist is also implied. There is a certain want of coherence between the two sentences: "Divide this among yourselves, *for* I will not drink of it henceforth until . . ." If the cup at the Eucharistic assemblies was also in Lk.'s mind, this wording can be accounted for: the believers drink of the cup, as Christ bade them, in anticipation of the time when they will drink it with him in the Kingdom of God (cf. Loisy *ad loc.*).

18. Reproduces Mk. xiv. 25 *ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.*

19a. *καὶ λαβὼν . . . σῶμά μου*] Mk. xiv. 22 *λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.* By sharing in the same loaf the disciples are united in communion with the one body of Christ. 1 Cor. x. 16 f. *τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἓν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.* The thanksgiving in the *Didache* is likewise grounded on the thought that the one loaf represents the unity of the believers. An explicit reference to the sacrificial death is first given by the Pauline interpolation which follows.

19 b-20. Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 24-25. The wording is almost identical, except for the addition of *διδόμενον* after the first *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, and the insertion of *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* (cf. Mk. *τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν*) in place of the repeated injunction to 'do this in remembrance of me' after the giving of the cup.

21-23. *The Traitor at the Table.* A briefer version of Mk. xiv. 17-21. Verse 22 closely reproduces Mk. xiv. 21. The only noteworthy difference from Mark, besides the change in the position of the sayings, is that whereas in Mark the disciples ask

παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης· ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς 22
μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐαὶ
τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαντο 23
συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο
μέλλων πράσσειν. Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία 24

Jesus 'Is it I?' in Luke 'they enquire among themselves.' There is no sufficient reason here to suspect a separate source. When the wording diverges from Mark, characteristic Lucan features appear.

21. πλήν] A favourite particle of transition in Luke (15 times in Gospel; 5 times in Mt.; never in Mk.).

22. κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον πορεύεται] Mk. xiv. 21 ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ. πορεύεσθαι (v. freq. in Lk.; never in Mk.) replaces ὑπάγειν in Mk. ii. 11 (= Lk. v. 24), v. 34 (= Lk. viii. 48). ὁρίζειν not in Mk., 5 times in Acts, also Ro. i. 4, Heb. iv. 7.

23. Characteristic of Lk. is the article with an indirect question (cf. *v.* 2 *supra*) and the use of the *optat.* (cf. iii. 15 and freq.).

24-26. *A dispute between the Apostles. He who is greatest serves.* There is close similarity to the words addressed by Jesus to the ten, on the occasion of their anger at the ambitious hopes of the sons of Zebedee, Mk. x. 41-45 (= Mt. xx. 25-28). Lk. has omitted this section of Mk. at xviii. 34. Differences both in wording and thought make it probable that Lk. is dependent on a non-Marcan source. In Mk. service is enjoined as the way to greatness; in Lk. those who are already in the position of leaders are bidden to follow the example of Christ who was in the midst of the disciples as one who served. A more striking difference is the absence from Lk. of the saying that the Son of Man came 'to give his life as a ransom for many.' This is replaced in Lk. by an appeal to the example of Jesus who lived in the midst of his disciples as one who served. We may compare Lk.'s omission of the words at the giving of the wine: 'the blood of the covenant which is shed for many.' The interpretation of the death of Christ as an offering for sin nowhere finds clear expression in this Gospel (cf. xxiv. 26 n.). It is held by Bousset and others that the Lucan form of these sayings is the more original and that the Marcan form has been developed from it.

The contrast between the servant who waits at table and the master upon whom he waits perhaps suggested the Last Supper to the evangelist or to his source as an appropriate setting for this most profound and authentic teaching of Jesus Christ. In point of fact the actual setting creates a difficulty: Jesus is not waiting at table, he is presiding at the meal, and distributes the bread and wine as master of the feast. The parable closely fits the thought, but it does not in reality suit the occasion (cf. J. Weiss). If Luke had related the 'feet-washing' of Jo. xiii., the difficulty would disappear. The question arises whether these sayings (with xii. 36 f.) have not suggested the great opening scene of the supper in St. John's Gospel (so Wellh., Loisy).

24. φιλονεικία] Here only in N.T. Also 2 Macc. iv. 4; 4 Macc. i. 26, viii. 26.

25 ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν
αὐτοῖς Οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ
26 ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ
οὕτως, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος, καὶ ὁ
27 ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν· τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ
ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν
28 εἰμὶ ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. Ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες

26 *ο νεωτερος*] *ο μικροτερος* D a c ff$^2$ 26, 27, 28 add D *μαλλον η ο ανακειμενος* post *ως ο διακονων*: om D *τις γαρ . . . ουχι ο ανακειμενος*: *εγω δε . . . οι διαμεμενηκοτες*] *εγω γαρ εν μεσω υμων ηλθον ουχ ως ο ανακειμενος αλλ ως ο διακονων και υμεις ηυξηθητε εν τη διακονια μου ως ο διακονων οι διαμεμενηκοτες* D

25. *εὐεργέται καλοῦνται*] Not in Mk. The title *εὐεργέτης* was frequently assumed by Hellenistic kings in Syria and Egypt. Cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 253.

26. Readers of the Gospel would naturally think of the apostles as future rulers of the Church. *ὁ νεώτερος*] The word could be used in a quasi-technical sense of the younger members of the Church, Ac. v. 6. *ὁ ἡγούμενος*] Exc. Mt. ii. 6 (O.T. quotation) here only in Gospels; used of leaders in the Church Ac. xv. 22; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24. *ὡς ὁ διακονῶν*] Cf. Ac. vi. 2.

27. Jesus is of course greater than his disciples, yet he is as their servant. The variant and interesting addition in D can hardly be original.

*ὁ ἀνακείμενος*] *ἀνακεῖσθαι*, 'to sit at meat,' used by all the evv. Not approved by Phryn. cxci.: *ἀνακεῖται μὲν γὰρ ἀνδριὰς καὶ ἀναθήματα, καλῶς ἐρεῖς· ἀνακεῖται δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης οὐκέτι, ἀλλὰ κεῖται.*

28-30. *The dignity which awaits the Twelve in the coming kingdom.* Verses 28 and 30b seem to be a variant version of a saying which Mt. has interpolated (xix. 28) into his version of Mk. x. 28-31 *Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθίσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.* Verses 29-30a are peculiar to Lk. The picture of the Messianic feast does not blend with the picture of the thrones of judgement. It seems probable that Lk. has expanded the saying 28-30 b and adapted it to its setting at the Last Supper: *v.* 28 is an 'idealized' form (Klostermann) of Mt. xix. 28 (*οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι*), and the assignment of the kingdom to the disciples, in which they are to sit at meat with their Lord, carries on the thought of *vv.* 16, 18.

28. There is no very close connexion with the preceding verses. The faithfulness of the disciples explains the honour which they are to receive. That Jesus had lived under the pressure of *πειρασμοί* is not an idea which is emphasised in the Gospels. But cf. Mk. viii. 33, where Jesus recognises Satan as speaking to him through the mouth of Peter, and Lk. iv. 13 *καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ*, where the words *ἄχρι καιροῦ* are peculiar to Lk.

*μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου· κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν,* 29
*καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν, ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ* 30
*πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, καὶ*
*καθῆσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες τοῦ*
*Ἰσραήλ. Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς* 31
*τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ ἵνα* 32
*μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ πίστις σου· καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον*

30 *καθησθε* B*ΓΔ : *καθεζησθε* D : *καθησεσθε* ℵAL al pler

29. *διατίθεμαι*] 'I assign.' The word is probably meant to recall the Biblical *διαθήκη*, 'covenant,' and the verse is perhaps intended as a substitute for the words at the giving of the cup—*τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης*—omitted from Mk. It is not necessary to assume that Lk. has interpreted *διαθήκη* as 'will' or 'testament,' though this, the common Greek usage, may have been in his mind; cf. Heb. ix. 15 f. where the argument depends on the ambiguity of the word *διαθήκη*—'covenant' or 'will.' It seems best to make the clause *ἵνα ἔσθητε κτλ.* the object of *διατίθεμαι* and to reserve *βασιλείαν* as object to *διέθετο* (according to the punctuation of W.H.). Most critics, however, make *βασιλείαν* object to both verbs. *βασιλεία* must then be given a slightly different meaning in *v.* 29, 'rule,' from that in *v.* 30, 'my kingdom.' This is awkward, and it is a further objection that to dine at a king's table is not a sign of sharing his authority.

30. *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου*] An unusual phrase, cf. xxiii. 42.

*καθῆσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων*] The language is probably based on Ps. cxxii. 4-5. For this conception of the function of 'the Twelve' cf. vi. 12 f. introd.

31-34. In Mk. Jesus foretells Peter's denial on the way to Gethsemane after the Supper. Verses 33-34 are roughly parallel to Mk. xiv. 29-31, but *vv.* 31-32 are peculiar to Lk. and may depend upon another source. "That Peter was the first to see the Lord and thereby became the founder of the Gospel and of the Church is clearly reflected in the words," Wellh.

31. *ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο*] As he asked for Job. For the verb cf. Plut. *De or. def.* 417 d *οὕτως ἰσχυροὶ καὶ βίαιοι δαίμονες ἐξαιτούμενοι ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην κτλ.*

*σινιάσαι*] A non-classical word. For the met. cf. Amos ix. 9.

32. *περὶ σοῦ*] Satan had asked for the apostles; the Lord prays for Peter that the apostles may be confirmed through him. *ἐπιστρέψας*] Intrans. as in Ac. iii. 19, i.e. when Peter has been converted after his fall; this seems better than to take it with Zahn and others as trans. (cf. i. 16), 'convert and strengthen.' There is a curious verbal similarity between *vv.* 32, 33 and 2 Regn. xv. 20, 21 (David and Ittai on the way to the brook Kidron): *καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς Σεθθεί . . . ἐπιστρέφου καὶ ἐπίστρεψον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ κύριος ποιήσει μετὰ σοῦ ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαν. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη . . . εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ ἐὰν ᾖ ὁ κύριός μου, καὶ ἐὰν εἰς θάνατον καὶ ἐὰν εἰς ζωήν, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ δοῦλός σου.* The verbal echoes are possibly not accidental, cf. *Beginnings*, vol. ii. p. 104. The leadership

33 τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Κύριε, μετὰ σοῦ
ἕτοιμός εἰμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι.
34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέ-
35 κτωρ ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι. Καὶ
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλλαντίου καὶ
πήρας καὶ ὑποδημάτων, μή τινος ὑστερήσατε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν

of Peter is not less prominent in Lk. than in Mt. xvi. 18 and Jo. xxi. 15 f.

33. εἰς φυλακήν] No parallel in Mk. The words perhaps reflect the later history of Peter, cf. Ac. xii. 5 f. The Lord's prayer was answered: in spite of temporary failure, Peter finally acted up to and fulfilled his loyal protestation.

35-38. Jesus bids the disciples arm themselves to meet impending disaster. Peculiar to Luke. The connexions between 36 and 37 and between 37 and 38 are not easy to catch, and the meaning of the whole is obscure. It is unlikely that Jesus seriously entertained the thought of armed resistance, which indeed would be in conflict with the whole tenor of his life and teaching, and it is perhaps even more unlikely that some early source (utilised by Lk.) would, as Loisy tentatively suggests, have represented Jesus as foreseeing and encouraging an attempt at resistance which failed. "But it is possible," Loisy continues, "and perhaps more probable, that the evangelist has awkwardly constructed the whole of the present passage on the simple fact of the resistance recorded in the source of Mk., and in order to prepare for what he wished to retain from it in his narrative of the arrest." Wellh. also connects *v.* 38 with *v.* 49 and conjectures that *v.* 38 was the starting-point of the present paragraph. The mention of a sword, he holds, is the only clear point of connexion between 38 and 35-36. Verses 35-36 should properly refer to preparations for a dangerous journey and are not explained by the succeeding prophecy of Jesus' death. Here as elsewhere Lk. has combined ancient and late material without succeeding in effecting unity of idea. J. Weiss thinks that the warlike tone of *v.* 36—so contrary to the spirit of the Gospel and to the temper of the early Church—cannot have been invented. The words must have been called forth by some definite occasion. Jesus really spoke the words on the way to Jerusalem (cf. xii. 49). He knows that he must die, but "he hopes that his disciples will cut their way out." It seems better to assume that Jesus intended the words of *v.* 36 to be accepted in a general sense as a warning that disaster is coming, cf. Mt. x. 34 (= Lk. xii. 51), and that the disciples misunderstand him. This at any rate appears to be the most satisfactory line of interpretation for the passage as it now stands in the Gospel.

35. ὅτε ἀπέστειλα κτλ.] The counterpart to these words occurs in x. 1 f., which, however, is addressed to the seventy, not to the Twelve. In the charge to the Twelve (ix. 1 f.) there is no mention of purse or sandals. If with Loisy we prefer to assign the composition of this passage to the evangelist, we may easily explain the slight discrepancy by supposing a slip of memory on the part of the evangelist. If, on the other hand, we

Οὐθενός. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἀλλὰ νῦν ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον 36
ἀράτω, ὁμοίως καὶ πήραν, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πωλησάτω τὸ
ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν 37
ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό
Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος
ἔχει. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Κύριε, ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι ὧδε δύο. ὁ δὲ 38
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἱκανόν ἐστιν.

are inclined to conjecture, with Feine, Streeter, and others, that this, with other peculiar Lucan matter, had been already fused with Q before its incorporation in this Gospel, we shall trace the connexion between x. 1 and this verse to an earlier source. On either view we shall regard the assignation of the charge in x. 1 f. to the seventy as a later insertion of the ultimate editor, who has failed to notice the slight discrepancy which his editing has created.

36. *ὁ μὴ ἔχων*] sc. *μάχαιραν*. Or we might supply *βαλλάντιον κτλ.* as object from the previous clause, and throw the emphasis on *πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον*, i.e. buy swords at all costs. But this is less satisfactory. They will all need swords. Klostermann suggests that *ὁ ἔχων* and *ὁ μὴ ἔχων* might be taken absolutely: 'he who is provided,' 'he who is destitute.' But a sword would not be less necessary to the former class than to the latter.

37. The only clear reference in the Gospels to Is. liii. The declaration of the fulfilment of Scripture replaces Mk. xiv. 49b (at the arrest) omitted below at *v.* 53. The connexion here with the verse preceding appears to be that if such is to be the fate of the master, the disciples likewise must be prepared for danger. *καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει*] Best taken as co-ordinate with, rather than dependent upon, *λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι κτλ.*, i.e. it is a further explanation of the need for preparation. Possibly 37a is a secondary addition by the evangelist. *τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ* is interpreted by Klostermann to mean 'my life on earth' (*mein Lebensgeschick*) and distinct in meaning from *τὸ γεγραμμένον περὶ ἐμοῦ*. It is easier to connect it with the quotation preceding.

38. *ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι ὧδε δύο*] The disciples take Jesus at his word and produce two swords. One of them is to be used by Peter at the arrest. *ἱκανόν ἐστι*] Perhaps an ironical assent, *μονονουχὶ διαγελᾷ* Cyr. Alex. Or perhaps a Semitic formula to break off the conversation, Heb. רב, cf. Deut. iii. 26 LXX *ἱκανούσθω σοι, μὴ προσθῇς ἔτι λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον*. (So Klostermann.)

This is the text in which the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. discovered the 'two swords' of worldly and spiritual authority.

## THE PRAYER OF JESUS ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES. THE ARREST

(xxii. 39-53)

The Lucan narrative of the prayer before the arrest is much briefer than the Marcan. The special mention of Peter, James, and John, who, in Mark, remain with Jesus when the other disciples have been left behind (Mk. xiv. 33), disappears, and the thrice-repeated prayer of Jesus with the three returns of Jesus to the sleeping disciples are reduced to one prayer and one return. Loisy thinks that, in addition to Mark, Luke used one of Mark's sources which gave a simpler and shorter narrative than that in the canonical Mark. It is certain that the Lucan narrative is not unrelated to the Marcan. Cf. *vv.* 42, 45 with Mk. xiv. 36, 38. The differences between Mark and Luke do not appear incompatible with the simpler hypothesis of editorial abbreviation (and expansion, if *vv.* 43, 44 are genuine) of the basic Marcan text.

The account of the arrest again shews unmistakable dependence upon Mark, both in the general sequence of the narrative and in details of the phraseology. Cf. especially *v.* 47 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος with Mk. xiv. 43; *v.* 50 καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἷς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον καὶ ἀφεῖλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ with Mk. xiv. 47 εἷς δέ τις τῶν παρεστηκότων . . . ἔπαισεν τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον; *vv.* 52b, 53a, which are an almost exact equivalent for Mk. xiv. 48, 49a. The statement that Judas arranged beforehand the sign of the kiss is replaced by the question of Jesus: 'Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?' This alteration effects an abbreviation, heightens the dramatic effect, and also shews Jesus to be cognisant of Judas's intention. The last-mentioned motive has also led Matthew to interpolate a saying addressed by Jesus to Judas: Ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει; Mt. xxvi. 50. Other additions, omissions, and alterations may all be set down to editorial treatment of Mark.

39 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν
40 Ἐλαιῶν· ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ [καὶ] οἱ μαθηταί. γενό-
μενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Προσεύχεσθε μὴ
41 εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐ-

39 και οι] om και B al

39. κατὰ τὸ ἔθος] Cf. xxi. 37. This was the last of many evening journeys to the Mount of Olives.

40. ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου] 'at the spot.' Not a very natural phrase to apply to the Mount of Olives. Lk. is prob. influenced by his Marcan source: εἰς χώριον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανεί; he omits the foreign name (cf. the omission of Γολγοθά xxiii. 33) and substitutes the general phrase ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου 'the place.'

προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν] The same injunction is repeated at the end of the section *v.* 46. Similar words in Mark are addressed by Jesus to the three disciples on the occasion of his first return from prayer. Lk., as often elsewhere, has compressed the Marcan narrative. The words recall the last clause of the pattern prayer, xi. 4.

41. ἀπεσπάσθη] 'he withdrew.' The usage of this word in the later

*τῶν ὡσεὶ λίθον βολήν, καὶ θεὶς τὰ γόνατα προσηύχετο*
*λέγων Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον* 42
*ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.*
*[ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν.* 43
*καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ* 44
*ἐγένετο ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαί-*
*νοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.] καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς* 45
*ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εὗρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς*
*λύπης, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσ-* 46
*εύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. Ἔτι* 47
*αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας εἷς*

42 *ει βουλει . . . απ' εμου*] habent post *μη* (om *πλην*) *το θελημα . . . γινεσθω* D a c e ff$^2$ 43, 44 *ωφθη δε . . . επι την γην* ℵ*DL al pler latt syrr (cur.vg) boh (codd) Justin Iren Hipp Dion-Alex Eus Arius Greg-Naz Epiph Did Hil Hier Aug al: om ℵ$^a$ ABNRTW 69 etc (habent 69 etc apud Matt xxvi inter vv. 39 et 40) 579 (al sive asteriscis sive obelis notant) codd ap Epiph codd graec et lat apud Hil et Hier f syr(sin.hl-mg) arm aegg Cyr Ambr

vernacular seems to shew that violence is not, as in class. Gk., ordinarily connoted by the vb., cf. M.M. *s.v.* *ὡσεὶ λίθον βολήν*] Mk. *μικρόν*, cf. Gen. xxi. 16 *ὡσεὶ τόξου βολήν*; Hom. *Il.* iii. 12. *θεὶς τὰ γόνατα*] Less expressive than Mk. *ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*.

42. *Πάτερ*] Lk. omits the Aram. synonym *Ἀββά*. *εἰ βούλει*] Gives the sense of Mk. *πάντα δυνατά σοι*.

*μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου κτλ.*] Mk. *ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ*. Lk.'s version is nearer the form in the Lord's Prayer, Mt. vi. 10. But this clause is not contained in Lk. xi. 2 f.

43-44. Though omitted in B syr.sin and other MSS. these verses are strongly attested by MS. authority, and they were read by Justin, Tatian, Iren. and Hipp. They may be a very early 'Western' interpolation (so W.H.), or they may have been omitted in some Alexandrian texts for the same doctrinal motive which led St. John entirely to omit the agony and the prayer in the garden. Epiph. records that the verses were perplexing to some orthodox of his own day as seeming incompatible with the Divinity of Christ. That the verses were an authentic part of the Lucan text is maintained by Harnack, Streeter, Loisy. Harnack points out features characteristic of the Lucan style and vocabulary. *ἐκτενῶς* is used again in connexion with prayer, Ac. xii. 5; *ἐνισχύω* recurs Ac. ix. 19. (Harnack, *Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu*, in *Berlin. Sitz. Ber.*, 1901, p. 251.) It might have been expected that the appearance of the strengthening angel would be recorded after rather than before the earnest prayer and the bloody sweat.

45. *ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης*] A Lucan addition which explains and excuses the sleep of the disciples.

46. In place of the confused and difficult words, Mk. xiv. 41, 42, Lk. repeats (cf. *v.* 40) the injunction to pray against temptation.

47. *ὄχλος*] Defined in Mk. as having been sent from the chief

*τῶν δώδεκα προήρχετο αὐτούς, καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ*
48 *φιλῆσαι αὐτόν. Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἰούδα, φιλήματι*
49 *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως; ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐ-*
*τὸν τὸ ἐσόμενον εἶπαν* Κύριε, *εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ;*
50 *καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἷς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον καὶ*
51 *ἀφεῖλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς*
*εἶπεν* Ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου· *καὶ ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου ἰάσατο*
52 *αὐτόν. εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ’ αὐ-*
*τὸν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους*
*Ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων;*
53 *καθ’ ἡμέραν ὄντος μου μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὐκ ἐξ-*

51 *ο Ιησους*] om *ο* B

priests and scribes and elders. This description is omitted here, as Lk. (*v.* 52) is to make chief priests and scribes present in person to be addressed and rebuked by Jesus.

49-51. The incident of the wounding of the high priest's servant comes from Mk., but it has been amplified. (i.) The disciples ask, though we are not told that they receive an answer, whether they shall use the sword. The dialogue reported *v.* 35 *supra* may explain the addition. (ii.) Jesus checks further violence and heals the wounded man: a very natural embellishment of the history, in keeping alike with the character of Jesus and the art of the evangelist. In Mk. the assault follows the arrest. In Lk.—and in Jo.—the arrest is not completed until the words of Jesus have been ended.

50. *τὸ δεξιόν*] So also Jo. xviii. 10. Not in Mk. A similar addition is made by Lk. to his source in vi. 6 *ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιά*; contrast Mk. iii. 1.

51. *ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου*] Addressed to the disciples, not to the arresting band, which is first addressed in *v.* 52. The exact meaning is obscure. *τούτου* might refer to the assault, in which case the meaning would be: 'Suffer your resistance to go thus far—but not further.' But it is better to refer *τούτου* to the arrest: 'Let events take their course—even to my arrest.'

52-53. The words 52b, 53a are in Mk. addressed to the servants who effect the arrest. In Lk. the rulers themselves are present. This —improbable in itself—gives the evangelist a more effective setting for the words of Jesus. The concluding words of *v.* 53 *ἀλλ’ αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους* replace *ἀλλ’ ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί* (Mk.). Taylor thinks they come from an independent account in Proto-Luke and that they have been conflated in the present text with an extract from Mk. But the words could not stand alone: they demand the contrast of the Marcan sentence which precedes. They therefore confirm the hypothesis adopted above that the differences here between Mk. and Lk. are to be ascribed to editorial modification of Mk. and not to conflation of two distinct and continuous sources.

The words, which have a Johannine

ετείνατε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' ἐμέ· ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους.

ring, make a fine conclusion to the scene. ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα, i.e. night, which gives cover to dark deeds, cf. Jo. iii. 19. The 'power of darkness' is both literal and symbolic. Cf. Jo. xiii. 30 (the departure of Judas into the darkness of night). Lk. omits from Mk. the flight of the disciples (*v.* 50) and the escape of the young man (*vv.* 51-52).

### THE EXAMINATION OF JESUS BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN (xxii. 54-71)

St. Mark relates that when Jesus had been taken to the house of the high priest, a meeting was held of the whole Sanhedrin, at which, after fruitless attempts to secure conclusive evidence, it was alleged that Jesus had said that he would destroy the Temple, and in three days build another not made with hands. When the evidence was again found wanting, the high priest directly asked Jesus whether he were the Christ, and, on Jesus avowing that he was, the high priest and the Sanhedrin adjudged him to be guilty of blasphemy and deserving of the death penalty. Jesus is mishandled and mocked. Then, after recording the denials of Peter in the court below, Mark proceeds to mention a further meeting of 'the whole Sanhedrin' in the early morning, from which Jesus was led, bound, by the Jewish rulers to Pilate.

For the historical questions raised by the later Rabbinical Criminal Code, and its bearing on the Trial narratives in the Gospels, reference should be made to R. W. Husband, *The Prosecution of Jesus: its Date, History, and Legality* (Princeton, 1916); H. Danby, *The Bearing of the Rabbinical Criminal Code on the Jewish Trial Narratives in the Gospels*, *J.Th.S.* xxi. pp. 51 f.; Abrahams' *Studies*, ii. pp. 129 f. It must suffice here to say that it is improbable that a Jewish Court had jurisdiction to try a prisoner on a capital charge, as Mark represents (cf. Jo. xviii. 31), and probable that Mark gives a popular rather than an accurate account of proceedings which, in reality, were of the nature of preliminary enquiry as to what case would lie against Jesus before the Governor. That the question of the Messiahship was raised before the Jewish rulers, and that Jesus did not repudiate the suggestion that he claimed to be Messiah, is corroborated by the subsequent course of events when Jesus was taken before Pilate. Cf. E. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge*, i. pp. 187 f., for a weighty defence of the substantial historicity of the Marcan narrative. Wellhausen's theory that the charge of blasphemy was based on the saying concerning the destruction of the Temple, and that the high priest's question as to the Messiahship is a later interpolation, does violence to the text.

The Lucan narratives differ from the Marcan in several respects:

(1) The two meetings of the Sanhedrin (Mk. xiv. 53, xv. 1) are merged into one, which takes place in the early morning after the arrest. It is at this meeting that Jesus is asked whether he is Messiah. This in itself seems more probable than the Marcan narrative of a full meeting of the Sanhedrin on the preceding night. Possibly the two meetings implied in the text of Mark are really due to combination of sources rather than to distinct tradition.

(2) The accusation that Jesus had threatened to destroy the Temple is omitted. (So also, in the account of the Crucifixion, the gibe of Mk. xv. 29, 'Ah, thou that destroyest the Temple, etc.,' is omitted.) The whole emphasis falls upon the charge that Jesus claims to be Messiah. (It is a charge against Stephen in Acts vi. 14 that he declared that Jesus would destroy the Temple.)

(3) Luke, like the Fourth Evangelist, avoids the constitutional mistake of making the Sanhedrin condemn Jesus to death.

(4) Consequent upon the change in position of the Trial narrative is a transposition of the narrative of Peter's denials, which now precede the Trial, and take place while Jesus is in custody at the house of the high priest; and

(5) a transposition of the horseplay which in Mark follows the Trial. This is now assigned, with greater plausibility, to the attendants at the high priest's house.

The dependence upon Mark is close in the account of Peter's denials, and unmistakable in the account of the Trial. Luke may be drawing upon a special source in addition to Mark, or possibly upon special traditions orally transmitted. But it may be that his modifications are to be ascribed to intelligent criticism of Mark on the part of himself or his circle, and to motives —literary and religious—such as we can trace elsewhere. For the fusion of the two meetings of the Sanhedrin cf. xix. 45, where two separate journeys to Jerusalem (so Mark) are telescoped into one, and the purging of the Temple transposed to follow immediately on the arrival of Jesus in the Holy City. Various points of detail will be noted below which seem to indicate that peculiar features in the Lucan Trial narrative are secondary.

54 *Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον καὶ εἰσήγαγον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει μακρόθεν.*
55 *περιαψάντων δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ συνκαθισάν-*
56 *των ἐκάθητο ὁ Πέτρος μέσος αὐτῶν. ἰδοῦσα δὲ αὐτὸν*
*παιδίσκη τις καθήμενον πρὸς τὸ φῶς καὶ ἀτενίσασα αὐτῷ*

54-55. || Mk. xiv. 53a-54.

56 f. ἀτενίσασα] A favourite Lucan word (12 times), Mk. ἐμβλέψασα.

εἶπεν Καὶ οὗτος σὺν αὐτῷ ἦν. ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο λέ- 57
γων Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, γύναι. καὶ μετὰ βραχὺ ἕτερος 58
ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἔφη Καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· ὁ δὲ Πέτρος
ἔφη Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί. καὶ διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς 59
ἄλλος τις διισχυρίζετο λέγων Ἐπ' ἀληθείας καὶ οὗτος
μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦν, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν· εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέ- 60
τρος Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις. καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔτι
λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ. καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ 61
κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ
ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα
φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. [καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω 62
ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.] Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες 63

62 vers om lat. vt

58-59. καὶ . . . ἕτερος . . . καὶ . . . ἄλλος τις] In Mk. the second denial is provoked by the maid who had first accosted Peter, and the third by οἱ παρεστῶτες.

59. διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς] More exact than Mk. μετὰ μικρόν. διισχυρίζετο] Class. In N.T. only here and Ac. xii. 15.

60. Lk. softens Mk.'s account by omitting ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύναι. Here and in *v.* 61, as in xxii. 34, Lk. omits to say with Mk. that the cock crowed *twice*.

61. καὶ στραφεὶς . . . τῷ Πέτρῳ] This dramatic touch, peculiar to Lk., seems to imply that Jesus was detained in the αὐλή. Acc. to Mk. xiv. 66, 68 Peter is below in the court, while Jesus is being tried within, and, after the first denial, withdraws to the porch προαύλιον. Note the Lucan usage of ὁ κύριος in narrative.

62. Exactly equivalent to Mt. xxvi. 75b whence it has prob. been interpolated into Lk. See crit. note. The obscure sentence of Mk. *v.* 72b seems to have puzzled both Mt. and Lk.

63-65. The attendants in charge of Jesus mishandle him and mock him. The parallel in Mk. xiv. 65 follows the trial. The most obvious interpretation of the Marcan text, from a grammatical point of view, ascribes the ill-treatment to some (τινες) of the judges. Mt. xxvi. 67 interprets Mk. in this sense. Lk. with greater plausibility assigns the ill-treatment to the men who held Jesus in custody. Prob. Mk. should be interpreted in the same sense: Mk. xiv. 65 should be regarded as opening a fresh incident, loosely connected with the narrative preceding. τινες then does not refer back to the subject of κατέκριναν (*v.* 64). For a similar ambiguity in Mk. cf. ii. 14-15. Those who hold that Lk. has a second source throughout the Passion narrative see its influence here. The text of *v.* 64 presents a difficult agreement between Mt. and Lk. against Mk. in the words τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε; which are not found in the best texts of Mk. The words are, however, read in Mk. by WΘ 69 etc., 579, 700, and if we may suppose that this reading is

64 αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν
ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες Προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας
65 σε; καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰς αὐτόν.
66 Καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ
λαοῦ, ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς
67 τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν, λέγοντες Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν
68 ἡμῖν. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε·
69 ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δὲ ἔσται
ὁ υἱὸϲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενοϲ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆϲ δυνάμεωϲ τοῦ

68 *αποκριθητε*] add [*μοι*] *η απολυσητε* [*με*] AD al pler latt syrr arm ϛ : om ℵBLT boh : add tantum *μοι* Θ 1 etc 22 157 sah Ambr

original, and that the words have dropped out in ℵB as well as D k, we have a simple explanation of the problem. Against the theory that the text of Lk. has been assimilated to Mt. (Bultmann, p. 164) is the preceding statement in Lk. that Jesus had been blindfolded, which gives point to, and almost demands the question. Streeter thinks that Mt.—who does not record the blindfolding—has been assimilated to Lk., and that the blindfolding in Mk. (om. D a f) has been interpolated from Lk. (*Four Gospels*, pp. 325 f.).

65. Peculiar to Lk. Prob. editorial expansion.

66. A meeting of the Sanhedrin is called at daybreak, as recorded in Mk. xv. 1. Lk. interpolates here an account of the interrogation of Jesus based on the narrative of Mk. xiv. 55 f. Dependence on Mk. comes out clearly at *v.* 71. Lk. has omitted the evidence of the witnesses that failed (Mk. *vv.* 55-59) with which in Mk. the proceedings open, but he retains from Mk. the saying of the high priest (ascribed in Lk. to the court) *τί ἔτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν;* (Mk. *τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων;*) which in Mk. refers back to the omitted verses.

67 f. Jesus is at once asked whether he is the Christ. The question of the high priest in Mk. is 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' to which Jesus gives an affirmative answer, proceeding to prophesy that his judges shall witness the coming of the Son of Man. Lk. separates the two titles. Without answering the question whether he is the Christ, Jesus declares that from henceforth the Son of Man is exalted at God's right hand. He is then asked whether he is Son of God, and the narrative reaches its climax when Jesus allows that he is. To Luke and to his readers Son of God is the supreme title of Jesus, which was capable of expressing his universal significance, whereas the use of 'Christ' as a title naturally tended to become subordinate.

68. The well-attested addition of *ἢ ἀπολύσητε* may be original. If so, its omission by ℵB etc. may be explained by reluctance to make Jesus express or imply a wish to be released.

69. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*] The coincidence of this with *ἀπ' ἄρτι* Mt. xxvi. 64 in the absence of a corresponding word in Mk. is remarkable. Each evangelist has similarly inserted the same phrase in the parallels to Mk. xiv. 25 (Mt. xxvi. 29, Lk. xxii. 18), where, however, the same idea is

θεοῦ· εἶπαν δὲ πάντες Σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; 70
ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη Ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. οἱ 71
δὲ εἶπαν Τί ἔτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν; αὐτοὶ γὰρ
ἠκούσαμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.

given in Mk. by οὐκέτι. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is characteristic of Lk., and ἀπ' ἄρτι of Mt. Lk. has amended the Marcan prophecy that the judges of Jesus will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven into the easier statement that from now (i.e. the end of the earthly life, the ἔξοδος of ix. 31) the Son of Man will be sitting at God's right hand; the days of his ἀνάλημψις (ix. 51) are now completed. τῆς δυνάμεως] In Mk. a Jewish periphrasis for God. Lk. explains the phrase by adding the possessive τοῦ θεοῦ.

70. In Mk. Jesus replies directly to the high priest's question: ἐγώ εἰμι. Mt. and Lk. have each modified the affirmation in a similar way. Mt. xxvi. 64 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Σὺ εἶπας. Streeter thinks that the reading of Θ 69 etc. in Mk. Σὺ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι is original, that this text has been variously modified by Mt. and Lk. Burkitt dissents on textual grounds, *J.Th.S.* xxvi. p. 293. Streeter's alternative suggestion may give the true explanation: "The σὺ εἶπας of Mt. and the ὑμεῖς λέγετε of Lk. are independent adaptations of the σὺ λέγεις of Mk. xv. 2 intended to assimilate our Lord's reply to the High Priest, to His reply to Pilate" (*Four Gospels*, p. 322). The exact meaning of the phrase is doubtful. There is no unquestioned evidence that it was an accepted formula of assent (Abrahams, *Studies*, ii. pp. 1 f.). But that it was understood to imply assent seems clear from this verse and also from Mt. xxvi. 25. But the personal pronoun (σύ, ὑμεῖς) must be significant: 'the statement is yours,' i.e. a certain protest against the question is implied. Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 352 σοῦ τάδ' οὐκ ἐμοῦ κλύεις. Blass, § 77. 3.

## JESUS BEFORE PILATE AND HEROD (xxiii. 1-25)

Mk. xv. 1-15 is Luke's fundamental source. From this are taken Pilate's question to Jesus with Jesus' answer (*v.* 3), the demand for the release of Barabbas (*v.* 18), Pilate's repeated attempts to secure the release of Jesus, and the final surrender of Pilate to the demands of the Jews. The narrative of Mark, however, has been both amplified and obscured. In Mark the multitude first appear upon the scene to demand the release of a prisoner at the feast; in answer to this demand Pilate proposes to release Jesus, whereupon the priests work upon the multitude to demand the release of a popular bandit and the condemnation of Jesus. In Luke 'the people' appear without explanation at *v.* 4, where they form one group with the chief priests. No explanation is offered of the demand that Barabbas should be released (*v.* 18), and a relative clause is somewhat awkwardly appended to explain who Barabbas was. The insertion of *v.* 17 (see critical note) is an early attempt to elucidate the narrative from the other Gospels. Luke makes the following additions to what he takes from Mark:

(1) He specifies the offences which the hierarchy allege against Jesus (*v.* 2). That some such charge was formally alleged, though it is not stated in Mark, must be assumed to explain Pilate's question 'Art thou the king of the Jews?'

(2) He makes Pilate thrice assert that he finds Jesus innocent (*vv.* 4, 14, 22). It is of importance for Luke's purpose that he should shew Jesus to have been guiltless of sedition in the eyes of the Roman authority, and this is brought out more emphatically than in Mark. A similar interest reappears repeatedly in Acts.

(3) He interpolates an account of a trial before Herod. This is narrated by Luke only of the Canonical evangelists, but it is taken up in the Gospel of Peter, where Herod is made to take a more responsible part than Pilate in the condemnation of Jesus. Whence Luke derived the story is unknown, but its origin may perhaps be discovered from Acts iv. 25 f.—the only other passage in the New Testament where Pilate and Herod are mentioned together as concerned with the death of Jesus. In this place Ps. ii. is quoted as prophetic of the Passion: "The kings of the earth stand up, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed." After the quotation of the prophetic Psalm, the 'kings' and the 'rulers' are identified as Pontius Pilate and Herod. This was a very natural interpretation of the Psalm, for Herod and Pilate were the two civil rulers under whom Jesus had lived, and they had both exerted their authority against him. This interpretation of the Psalm once accepted would encourage the association of the two names in connexion with the proceedings against Jesus, and it seems possible that it was a further development of this association to represent both Herod and Pilate as taking a part in the concluding scenes. Cf. Dibelius, *Z.N.T.W.*, 1915, pp. 113 f. If the story rested on early tradition, it is strange that it should not appear in Mark. Moreover it does not seem likely that Pilate would send a political prisoner to be tried before Antipas within his own jurisdiction. The details of the story also raise difficulties. In *v.* 10 the chief priests and scribes are found accusing Jesus before Herod, but in *v.* 15 they appear to have remained with Pilate to await the prisoner's return. The mockery of Jesus by Herod and his soldiers in *v.* 11 is closely parallel to the mockery by the Roman soldiers in Mk. xv. 16 f., after the trial before Pilate (omitted by Luke at the corresponding place). Luke was perhaps glad to transfer the outrage from the soldiery of Rome to the soldiery of the local tetrarch.

Καὶ ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ 1 XXI
τὸν Πειλᾶτον. ἤρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες 2
Τοῦτον εὕραμεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ κωλύοντα
φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι καὶ λέγοντα αὐτὸν χριστὸν βασιλέα
εἶναι. ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν λέγων Σὺ εἶ ὁ 3
βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ἔφη Σὺ
λέγεις. ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς 4
ὄχλους Οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ. οἱ 5
δὲ ἐπίσχυον λέγοντες ὅτι Ἀνασείει τὸν λαὸν διδάσκων καθ'
ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἕως
ὧδε. Πειλᾶτος δὲ ἀκούσας ἐπηρώτησεν εἰ [ὁ] ἄνθρωπος 6
Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν, καὶ ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας Ἡρῴδου 7
ἐστὶν ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἡρῴδην, ὄντα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν
Ἰεροσολύμοις ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις. Ὁ δὲ Ἡρῴδης 8

2 *εθνος ημων*] add *και καταλυοντα τον νομον και τους προφητας* lat.vt Marcion *καισαρι διδοναι*] add *και αποστρεφοντα τας γυναικας και τα τεκνα* Marcion cf ad *v.* 5 5 *εως ωδε*] add et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis non enim baptizantur (c -zatur) sicut et (c om) nos nec se mundant (c om nec se mundant) c e 6 *ο ανθρωπος*] om *ο* B al pauc

1. *ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν*] 'the whole number of the Sanhedrin.' The word *πλῆθος* does not mean 'the people.' It is used again of the Sanhedrin in Ac. xxiii. 7.

2. The charge that Jesus forbade payment of taxes is contradicted by the answer of Jesus recorded above by Lk. at xx. 20 f. *χριστὸν βασιλέα*] 'anointed king.' Better perhaps *Χριστὸν β.*, 'Christ, a king.' *βασιλέα* explains the Jewish title. A political interpretation is put upon the claim which Jesus had allowed. Epiph. *Adv. Haeres.* I. iii. 316, 317, 346 is the authority for the Greek text of Marcion's interpolations given in the critical note. They represent Jesus as charged with teaching and conduct such as were alleged against Marcion by the orthodox. Their infiltration into the Old Latin is very remarkable, cf. v. 39 n. Cf. Rendel Harris, *T. and S.* ii. 1, p. 230; Harnack, *Marcion*$^{2}$, p. 247*.

3. From Mark. On the meaning of *Σὺ λέγεις* cf. xxii. 70 n.

4 f. Peculiar to Lk. Pilate asserts that he finds the prisoner innocent. A further statement of the accusers of Jesus as to his activities 'beginning from Galilee' provides the connexion with the account of the trial before Herod. On hearing that he is a Galilean, Pilate sends him to the tetrarch of Galilee who was then in Jerusalem.

5. *Ἰουδαίας*] Palestine, cf. iv. 44 n.

7. *ἀνέπεμψεν* = *remittere*, 'to send up to a higher authority.' So in Ac. xxv. 21. Cf. Deissmann, *B.S.* p. 229, *N.B.S.* p. 56, and M.M. *s.v.*

*ὄντα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις*] Perhaps for the feast.

*ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν, ἦν γὰρ ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων*
*θέλων ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤλπιζέν*
9 *τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενον. ἐπηρώτα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν*
10 *λόγοις ἱκανοῖς· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ. ἱστήκεισαν*
*δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς εὐτόνως κατηγοροῦντες*
11 *αὐτοῦ. ἐξουθενήσας δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρῴδης σὺν τοῖς*
*στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμπαίξας περιβαλὼν ἐσθῆτα*
12 *λαμπρὰν ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν τῷ Πειλάτῳ. Ἐγένοντο δὲ*
*φίλοι ὅ τε Ἡρῴδης καὶ ὁ Πειλᾶτος ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*
*μετ' ἀλλήλων· προϋπῆρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς*
13 *αὐτούς. Πειλᾶτος δὲ συνκαλεσάμενος τοὺς ἀρχ-*
14 *ιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τὸν λαὸν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς*
*Προσηνέγκατέ μοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα*
*τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀνακρίνας οὐθὲν*
*εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ'*
15 *αὐτοῦ. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρῴδης, ἀνέπεμψεν γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς*

9 *αυτω*] add quasi non audiens c, as if he were not there syr.cur   10-12 hos vv om syr.sin   12 *οντες δε εν αηδια* praem D c: *προυπηρχον . . . αυτους* om D   15 *ανεπεμψεν γαρ αυτον προς ημας* ℵBL 69-13 (*υμας*) 157 al f aegg: *ανεπεμψα γαρ*

8. *ἦν γὰρ ἐξ ἱκανῶν κτλ.*] The explanation has been prepared for by the insertion in ix. 9 *καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν*. A more hostile aim is assigned to Herod's interest in Jesus in xiii. 31.

10-12. These verses are omitted in syr.sin, and Wellh. holds that they are not original. But this suspicion is not justified. The verses are required to maintain the sequence of the narrative, and the language has characteristic Lucan features. On this omission and on the curious addition to *v.* 9 in c and syr.cur cf. Burkitt, *Ev. da Meph.* ii. p. 303.

11. *ἐξουθενήσας*] From curiosity Herod passes to contempt. A very ingenious interpretation of the scene is given by Verrall, *J.Th.S.*, April 1909, p. 321, and particularly of this verse. He takes *σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν* in close relation to *ἐξουθενήσας*: "Herod—with his soldiers at his back—considered Jesus of no (political) importance." This is too subtle. Soldiers were associated in tradition with the mockery of the 'royal' prisoner, cf. Mk. xv. 16 f., and that is the association here. Cf. Introd. *supra*. *ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν*] 'a gorgeous robe'—to mock his claim to kingship, like the *πορφύρα* of Mk. xv. 17. Perhaps, as Loisy suggests, Lk. was glad to avoid a compromising reference to the imperial 'purple' in this connexion.

13-16. Pilate again affirms his conviction that Jesus is innocent of causing political disaffection, and proposes—as a concession to the accusers—to chastise the prisoner, and then to release him. Peculiar to Luke. This affords a transition to the demand for the release of Barabbas.

15. *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρῴδης*] 'No, nor

ἡμᾶς· καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον
αὐτῷ· παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω. ἀνέκραγον δὲ πανπληθεὶ 16
λέγοντες Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν 18
Βαραββᾶν· ὅστις ἦν διὰ στάσιν τινὰ γενομένην ἐν τῇ 19
πόλει καὶ φόνον βληθεὶς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. πάλιν δὲ ὁ 20
Πειλᾶτος προσεφώνησεν αὐτοῖς, θέλων ἀπολῦσαι τὸν
Ἰησοῦν. οἱ δὲ ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες Σταύρου σταύρου 21
αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ τρίτον εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Τί γὰρ κακὸν 22
ἐποίησεν οὗτος; οὐδὲν αἴτιον θανάτου εὗρον ἐν αὐτῷ·
παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω. οἱ δὲ ἐπέκειντο φωναῖς 23
μεγάλαις αἰτούμενοι αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ κατίσχυον
αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν. καὶ Πειλᾶτος ἐπέκρινεν γενέσθαι τὸ 24
αἴτημα αὐτῶν· ἀπέλυσεν δὲ τὸν διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον 25
βεβλημένον εἰς φυλακὴν ὃν ᾐτοῦντο, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκεν
τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

*υμας προς αυτον* AD al pler latt syr.hl ϛ : *ανεπεμψα γαρ αυτον προς αυτον* syrr (vt.vg) arm 16 add hic *v.* 17 *αναγκην δε ειχεν απολυειν αυτοις κατα εορτην ενα* ℵ al pler latt syrr(vg.hl) boh (codd) : om ABL al pauc a aegg. vide *v.* 19 19 post hunc v. habent *v.* 17 (vide supra) D syr. vt aeth

yet Herod,' who might be expected to know more of Jewish concerns than the Roman Pilate.

The text of the great Uncials is to be preferred, in spite of an apparent conflict with *v.* 10 which represents the chief priests as being present with Jesus before Herod. Here, as often in Lk., the claims of historical consistency must not be pressed too hard. The reading of AD etc. and that of the Syriac versions are possibly corrections to meet the inconsistency. They give an intolerably weak sense. There was no point in telling the Jews, what they already knew, that he had sent them (or Jesus) to Herod. The sense requires a reference to what Herod has done *after* hearing the case. This is given by the reading of ℵB. We must suppose that Herod's contemptuous dismissal of Jesus is interpreted as equivalent to an acquittal on the charge of sedition.

16. παιδεύσας] In Mk. (*v.* 15) Pilate scourges Jesus before handing him over for crucifixion; in Lk. he proposes to inflict scourging in place of the death penalty.

22. τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν οὗτος;] From Mk. xv. 14.

23 f. Pilate's mind is not changed, but Jewish clamour carries the day. Pilate gave sentence that *what they asked* should be done, and surrendered Jesus *to their will.* Lk.'s narrative almost seems to suggest that it was the Jews who took Jesus away to be crucified (*v.* 26). The mockery by the Roman soldiers, which in Mk. (xv. 16-20) follows the sentence, is omitted. But cf. *v.* 36 where he is mocked by soldiers on the cross.

### THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS (xxiii. 26-49)

Luke's picture of the crucifixion of Jesus is based upon Mark, but his treatment, which is highly characteristic, has given a different tone to the scene. Jesus' love for the sinner, powerful in death as during life, and his unconquered trust in the Father's providential care, lighten the unrelieved gloom of the Marcan narrative.

The following are the chief distinguishing features of the Lucan narrative:

(1) Jesus is followed to the place of crucifixion by weeping women, whom he bids weep rather for themselves and their children.

(2) In place of two reviling malefactors Luke tells of one impenitent and one penitent malefactor. The latter receives from Jesus a promise of blessedness.

(3) The cry of Jesus from the cross before his death is taken from Psalm xxxi. "[Father] into thy hands. . . ." This replaces the despairing cry from Ps. xxii., "My God, my God . . ."

The Marcan narrative has in other respects been abbreviated and rearranged. The following are the chief modifications:

(1) The crucifixion of the robbers is transposed to be recorded together with the crucifixion of Jesus. This was an obvious editorial amendment.

(2) Luke does not repeat Mark's statement that he was crucified at the third hour (9 A.M.). It might well seem to him that this allowed insufficient time for the trials before the Sanhedrin, before Pilate, before Herod, and then again before Pilate.

(3) The superscription over the cross is noted after, instead of before, the mockery, to which, in its new position, it makes a climax and a conclusion.

(4) The mocking reference of the chief priests to the destruction of the Temple is left out. This is consequent upon the previous omission of the charge at the trial that Jesus threatened to destroy the Temple (Mk. xiv. 57).

(5) The two Marcan accounts of the offering of drink to Jesus (*vv.* 23 and 36) are combined and placed after the mockery of the rulers. Soldiers (as in Mk. xv. 23) offer him vinegar (as in Mk. xv. 36). The reference to Elijah coming to save him is left out, and a mocking exhortation to the king of Israel (Mk. xv. 36) to save himself, similar to that already ascribed to the rulers, is ascribed to the soldiers.

It is probably not possible to determine how far the distinctive features of the Lucan Passion narrative are to be ascribed directly to the editorial hand of the evangelist, or how far he draws upon the work of an earlier craftsman. We have every reason to assume that here as elsewhere he has used the Marcan Gospel, but his other source may also have given an account of the crucifixion with characteristic features of its own. Some of the differences between the Lucan and the Marcan versions of the Passion recall typical differences between other Marcan narratives and similar narratives peculiar to Luke which the evangelist has taken from another source. The vividly drawn contrast between the penitent and the impenitent robber perhaps derives from the same cycle of tradition which told the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, and the stories of the penitent harlot and the penitent Zacchaeus. In each of the two latter cases the Lucan figure has a counterpart in the simpler type of Marcan story, but in Mark there is little or no individual characterisation, whereas the Lucan stories dwell upon the individual's penitence and the individual's forgiveness. But then it is impossible to escape a sense of the evangelist's own sympathy for these variations. He himself represents the same type of feeling and imagination. How much is to be set down to his own account it seems impossible to say.

*Καὶ ὡς ἀπήγαγον αὐτόν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σίμωνά τινα* 26
*Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ᾽ ἀγροῦ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν*
*φέρειν ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ* 27
*πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν αἳ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν*
*αὐτόν. στραφεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰς Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Θυγα-* 28

26. *ἐπιλαβόμενοι*] Mk. *ἀγγαρεύουσι*. If Lk. deliberately intended to convey the impression that it was the Jews who took Jesus away to crucifixion, this perhaps accounts for his avoiding the term *ἀγγαρεύειν*, which would be more appropriate to soldiers acting under public authority than to the Jews, cf. M.M. *s.v.* A criminal was usually expected to carry his own cross. Cf. Plut. *De ser. num. vind.* 554 a *τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὑτοῦ σταυρὸν*. Paully-Wissowa iv. 1731. Lk. omits Mk.'s identification of Simon as the father of Alexander and Rufus. *φέρειν ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*] Add. Luc. No doubt the evangelist intentionally echoes the sayings in ix. 23, xiv. 27.

27-31. Peculiar to Lk. The *πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ* seems to be distinguished from the women. It is the latter who mourned over his fate. The passage is perhaps coloured by the prophecy of Zech. xii. 10 f. The attitude of the crowds is variously described. Contrast xxiii. 4, 13 with *v.* 48 *infra*. The woes which hang over Jerusalem still fill the mind of the Lord, as when he drew near to the city, xix. 41 f. (also peculiar to Lk.). There is enough here for all the tears of the women of Jerusalem. Cf. Soph. *Philoct.* 339 f. *οἶμαι μὲν ἀρκεῖν σοί γε καὶ*

τέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ’ ἐμέ· πλὴν ἐφ’ ἑαυτὰς
29 κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ἡμέραι
ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσιν Μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἳ
30 οὐκ ἐγέννησαν καὶ μαστοὶ οἳ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν. τότε ἄρξονται
λέγειν τοῖϲ ὄρεϲιν Πέϲατε ἐφ’ ἡμᾶϲ καὶ τοῖϲ βουνοῖϲ Καλύψατε
31 ἡμᾶϲ· ὅτι εἰ ἐν ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ
32 τί γένηται; Ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο σὺν
33 αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι. Καὶ ὅτε ἦλθαν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον
τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον, ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς
34 κακούργους, ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν ὃν δὲ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. [ὁ δὲ
Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί

34 ο δε Ιησους . . . ποιουσι ℵ*ACD$^{2}$L al pler c e f ff$^{2}$ l vg syrr(cur.vg.hl) arm boh (codd) Iren (lat) Hom-Clem Orig (lat) Eus Constit Ap Bas Hil Ambr ϛ: habet inter *v.* 45 et *v.* 46 Diat: om ℵ$^{a}$BDWΘ 38 435 579 a b syr.sin aegg Cyr

*τὰ σ’, ὦ τάλας, | ἀλγήμαθ’, ὥστε μὴ τὰ τῶν πέλας στένειν.*

30. A quotation from Hosea x. 8.

31. This cannot be a continuation of the cry spoken of in the preceding verse. It is a justification for the foreboding already expressed: if the innocent Jesus (ἐν ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ) meets such a fate, what will be the fate of the guilty Jerusalem (ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ)? For Rabbinic parallels see S.B. ii. p. 263, and cf. Ezek. xx. 47. γένηται] Subj. to express a question of doubt or deliberation: 'What then shall happen . . . ?' In class. Gk. the deliberative subj. is usually confined to 1st person, but in later Gk. it is used more extensively. Cf. Mt. xxiii. 33 πῶς φύγητε; and see Blass, § 64. 6. D corrects here to γενήσεται.

33. Lk. omits the foreign name Golgotha, as he has omitted Gethsemane.

34. In the spirit of his own teaching (vi. 28) Jesus prays for his executioners. The prayer occurs in no other Gospel, and the weighty combination of B with D syr.sin and a b in omitting ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς . . . τί ποιοῦσιν leaves it improbable that the words were original in the Lucan text. The authenticity of the saying in Lk. is ably defended by Harnack (*Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu*, in *Berlin. Sitz.Ber.*, 1901, p. 255): the words were interpreted (wrongly) as a prayer for the forgiveness of the Jews and therefore were intolerable to the sentiment of the Church. Hence the omission. The words are authentic and apply to the soldiers who nailed Jesus to the cross. Cf. also Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 138. But the omission of a prayer so sublime and so Christ-like seems less probable than its insertion. A similar prayer is attributed to Stephen at his martyrdom (Ac. vii. 60), and an identical prayer to James the brother of the Lord in Heges. *apud* Eus. *H.E.* ii. 23. 16. The thought that ignorance is a ground for forgiveness is not infrequent in Gk. and Latin lit. (cf. Wettstein *ad loc.*), and is found in Philo, *In Flacc.* 2. 7, ii. 518 M. τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ κρείττονος διαμαρτάνοντι

ποιοῦσιν.] ΔΙΑΜΕΡΙΖΌΜΕΝΟΙ δὲ τὰ ἹΜΆΤΙΑ ΑΥ̓ΤΟΥ͂ ἜΒΑΛΟΝ ΚΛΗ͂ΡΟΝ.
καὶ ἱστήκει ὁ λαὸς ΘΕΩΡΩ͂Ν. ἘΞΕΜΥΚΤΉΡΙΖΟΝ δὲ καὶ οἱ 35
ἄρχοντες λέγοντες Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἐκλεκτός. ἐνέπαιξαν 36
δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται προσερχόμενοι, ὄΞΟΣ προσ-
φέροντες αὐτῷ καὶ λέγοντες Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν 37
Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ 38
Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ ΟΥΤΟΣ. Εἷς δὲ τῶν 39
κρεμασθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτόν Οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ
ὁ χριστός; σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ 40
ἕτερος ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη Οὐδὲ φοβῇ σὺ τὸν θεόν, ὅτι
ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ; καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως, ἄξια γὰρ 41
ὧν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν· οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον
ἔπραξεν. καὶ ἔλεγεν Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς 42
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀμήν σοι 43
λέγω, σήμερον μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ. Καὶ ἦν 44

---

38 *επ᾽ αυτω*] add *γραμμασιν ελληνικοις* [*και*] *ρωμαικοις* [*και*] *εβραικοις* ℵ*AD al paene omn latt syrr(vg.hl) arm boh (codd) Cyr ς : om ℵᵃBC*L 579 a syr.vt aegg 42, 43 *και ελεγεν . . . σημερον*] *και στραφεις προς τον κυριον ειπεν αυτω μνησθητι μου εν τη ημερα της ελευσεως σου. αποκριθεις δε ειπεν αυτω τω ενπλησοντι* (leg *επιπλησοντι*), *θαρσει σημερον* D 42 *εις την βασιλειαν*] BL c e f ff² l vg Or (iat) Hil : *εν τη βασιλεια* ℵAC al paene omn a b q Or Eus ς

*συγγνώμη δίδοται.* But that the thought should be transposed into a prayer uttered by the sufferer on behalf of his persecutors is in peculiar harmony with the spirit of Christ.

*διαμεριζόμενοι . . . κλῆρον*] From Ps. xxii. 19. Ps. xxii. has influenced the Passion narrative in all the Gospels. The quotation here is taken over from Mk. (xv. 24), but the wording of the next verse is a fresh echo of the Ps. which is not to be found in Mk.: cf. Ps. xxii. 8 *πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με.* The attitude of ὁ λαός is prob. to be understood as respectful, in contrast with the rulers, cf. *v.* 48 *infra*.

35. ὁ ἐκλεκτός] The term is freq. used of the heavenly Son of Man in Enoch. In the N.T. it is used as a Messianic title only by Lk., cf. ix. 35 ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος. The plural οἱ ἐκλεκτοί of the 'elect' Israel is of course frequent. The Messiah of the new Israel is 'the elect one' *par excellence.*

38. οὗτος] Add. Luc. It enhances the *mockery* of the description. For the addition in ℵD etc. cf. Jo. xix. 20.

42. Ἰησοῦ] Vocative.

43. Ἀμήν σοι λέγω] The unsupported evidence of D is insufficient to establish the interesting reading Θάρσει.

*σήμερον . . . ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ*] More is granted to the robber than he had asked. His blessedness is

ἤδη ὡσεὶ ὥρα ἕκτη καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν
45 ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος, ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ
46 καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον. καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ
ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ
47 πνεῦμά μου· τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης
τὸ γενόμενον ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων Ὄντως ὁ
48 ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν. καὶ πάντες οἱ συνπαραγενόμενοι
ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωρήσαντες τὰ
49 γενόμενα, τύπτοντες τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον. ἱστήκεισαν δὲ
πάντες οἱ ⌜γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ
συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὁρῶσαι ταῦτα.

45 *του ηλιου εκλειποντος*] (*εκλιποντος* ℵL al) ℵBC*L 579 codd ap Orig syr (hl.mg) aegg: *και εσκοτισθη ο ηλιος* AD codd paene omn codd pler ap Orig latt syrr Marcion al ϛ    48 *υπεστρεφον*] syr.vt and saying Woe to us! What hath befallen us? Woe to us from our sins! add g$^1$ dicentes Vae vobis (nobis emend Burkitt) quae facta sunt hodiae (nobis Burkitt) propter peccata nostra, adpropinquavit enim desolatio hierusalem. similia Diat. vide Burkitt *Ev. da Meph.* ii. p. 304 et ad loc. fortasse ex Evang sec Petr 7    49 *γυναικες*] *αι γυναικες* B 579 sah

not to be delayed for the vague future, when the kingdom is come, but that very day he is to be with Jesus in the Paradise of just souls departed. In the later Judaism the conception of an immediate transition at death to an appropriate state of bliss or punishment lay alongside the idea of the final judgement. Cf. xvi. 22 f. *supra* (with Klostermann *ad loc.*); Enoch xxii. 9 f.; S.B. ii. pp. 264 f.

45. *τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος*] An explanation of the darkness added by Lk., who, no doubt, had not realised the impossibility of a solar eclipse at the time of the Paschal full moon. The impossibility of the phenomenon was made the ground of an attack on the credibility of the Gospels in the third century. Origen met the difficulty by preferring the variant reading *καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος*, which perhaps itself really originated in the difficulty. For a full discussion cf. W.H. *Notes on Select Readings*, pp. 69 f.

46. *Πάτερ . . . τὸ πνεῦμά μου*] From Ps. xxxi. 5, with the address 'Father' prefixed.

47. *ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεόν*] A characteristic Lucan addition. *δίκαιος*] Mk. *υἱὸς θεοῦ*. Lk. prob. felt his own version of the centurion's words to be more fitting in the mouth of a stranger than the full confession of Jesus as Son of God.

48. The mourning of the multitudes (peculiar to Lk.) connects with *vv.* 27, 35 *supra*.

49. His acquaintances and the women watched him from afar. Mk. refers only to the women, whom he names. Lk. has already named the women, viii. 2, 3, though somewhat differently from Mk. See also xxiv. 10. Lk.'s language is again reminiscent of the Psalter: lxxxviii. (lxxxvii.) 8; xxxviii. (xxxvii.) 11.

### THE BURIAL OF JESUS; THE EMPTY TOMB; JESUS RISEN APPEARS TO THE DISCIPLES (xxiii. 50–xxiv. end)

Luke now proceeds to relate the events consequent upon the crucifixion of Jesus, which confirmed the belief that he was the Christ, and re-established the fellowship of his disciples.

The contents of this concluding section of the Gospel may be briefly summarised as follows:

xxiii. 50-56. Jesus was buried on Friday night by a member of the Sanhedrin in a new tomb.

xxiv. 1-11. Early on Sunday morning the tomb was visited by faithful women and was found to be empty. Two angels explain to the women that Jesus was risen, as he had foretold. The women report to the apostles what they had seen and heard. They are not believed.

13-35. On the same Sunday two disciples walking out of Jerusalem to Emmaus are joined by a stranger with whom they speak of the events of the last few days. The stranger stays to share their evening meal, and when he blesses and breaks the bread is recognised to be Jesus. Jesus disappears. The two at once return to Jerusalem, where they find the other disciples already convinced by an appearance to Simon that Jesus is risen indeed.

36-43. Jesus himself appears to them all, convinces them of the reality of his bodily resurrection, and eats before them.

44-49. He expounds to them the Scriptures which foretold the suffering and resurrection of Christ, declares them to be witnesses to all nations of what has been accomplished, and bids them await in Jerusalem the gift of power from on high.

50-53. He takes them to Bethany and there is parted from them. The disciples return to Jerusalem.

Luke thus gives a carefully constructed and consecutive narrative. All the three recorded appearances are represented as happening in Jerusalem or the near neighbourhood and on the same first day of the week. Moreover, it is natural, though perhaps not strictly necessary (see xxiv. 44 n.), to suppose that the final departure of the risen Lord immediately succeeded the third appearance. But the τάξις has been imposed by the historian upon his materials, and the links are the least original part of the story. For the account of the empty tomb Luke depends upon Mark. But he has modified his source at two important points: (1) the angelic prophecy of an appearance in Galilee disappears, and (2) the women, who in Mark 'say nothing to anybody,' at once report their experiences to the Twelve. These events, as thus conceived, are the presupposition of the conversation on the way to Emmaus, when Jesus gives to the two disciples the clue to their proper interpretation. When the two return to Jerusalem they find the disciples already convinced of the Resurrection; but it is not easy to reconcile this conviction with the behaviour which is subsequently ascribed to them when Jesus appears, for the scene which follows seems rather to describe a first appearance to unexpectant and frightened men.

On internal grounds, therefore, it seems probable that the historian is combining different lines of tradition, and the probability is confirmed when the Lucan narrative is compared with other forms of the tradition. There is one outstanding discrepancy between Luke and John on the one hand, and Mark and Matthew on the other, as to the appearance to the disciples: according to Mark and Matthew the appearance occurred in Galilee, according to Luke and John the disciples saw the Lord in Jerusalem and, according to Luke, did not leave the city before Pentecost. The former tradition is probably not only the earlier but also true to fact (see Additional Note). It may reasonably be conjectured that the Galilean appearance of Mark and Matthew is the same as the appearance 'to the Twelve' recorded by Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5). According to Paul the appearance to the Twelve was preceded by an appearance to Peter. This is in agreement with Luke. We may conjecture, therefore, that Luke's narrative goes back to two fundamental sources: (1) the account of the empty tomb in Mark; (2) the tradition recognised by Paul and probably presupposed by Mark that the Lord appeared first to Cephas, then to the Twelve. In the tradition as presented by Luke the appearances took place in or near Jerusalem. But this is probably a later modification of the Galilean tradition, and is certainly in conflict with Mk. xvi. 7.

Luke has linked together the accounts of the empty tomb and of the appearance to the Twelve by the story of the journey to Emmaus. In this story Luke's artistic powers are seen at their height. The suspense and excitement which every reader feels as he reads may well correspond to the actual feelings of many disciples in those first days. But the close dependence of the dialogue upon the story of the empty tomb *in its modified form* (*vv.* 22-24 with notes, and contrast Mk. xvi. 9) warns us not to press the detail. It is literary creation, not detailed recollection. But there seems to be no good reason why the story should not be founded on fact. That Jesus appeared to two disciples at a village outside Jerusalem and was made known to them in the breaking of bread may well be true, and may have been handed down—perhaps as one among several such stories—in the Judaean churches. Luke has seized upon it and made it the foundation of the most vivid story of a Resurrection appearance which we possess.

Luke wrote perhaps half a century after the events he narrates and for churches far removed from Galilee and Judaea. It was his task to give literary form and consistency to the traditions of the life and work of Jesus Christ and to set them in a broad historical perspective. Jesus had begun his ministry in Galilee and then made his way to Jerusalem. There he had been crucified and buried, and there he rose from the dead. Thence, too, the preaching of the Gospel to all nations began. Such is the broad impression Luke wished to convey. He would not have understood the scruples or the methods of a modern critic. To adhere closely to the letter of Mark in the matter of the appearance in Galilee would have been to spoil the symmetry of his picture, and—he may well have felt—to distort the perspective. From the Crucifixion to Pentecost it was Jerusalem that mattered.

*Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσὴφ βουλευτὴς ὑπάρχων,* 50
*ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος,— οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συνκατατεθειμένος* 51
*τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν,—ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας*
*πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃς προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ*
*θεοῦ, οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πειλάτῳ ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ* 52
*Ἰησοῦ, καὶ καθελὼν ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ σινδόνι, καὶ ἔθηκεν* 53
*αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὔπω κείμενος.*

53 *κειμενος*] add *και προσεκυλισεν λιθον* [*μεγαν*] *επι την θυραν του μνημειου* U 69 etc 700 al pauc boh aeth : *και θεντος αυτου επεθηκεν τω μνημειω λιθον* [*μεγαν*] *ον μογις εικοσι εκυλιον* D 0124 1071 (usque ad *λιθον*) c sah

50. *ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος*] *εὐσχήμων* (Mk.) is ambiguous, cf. Phryn. cccix. *εὐσχήμων· τοῦτο μὲν οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ ἐν ἀξιώματι ὄντος τάττουσιν· οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ συμμέτρου.* Mt., prob. rightly, understands Mk. to intend the vulgar meaning and interprets *πλούσιος*: Lk. interprets of moral character. Cf. Ro. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 12.

51. *οὗτος οὐκ ἦν . . . αὐτῶν*] Add. Luc. to explain how a member of the Sanhedrin who had condemned Jesus could act thus. *πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων*] A geographical note added by Lk., cf. iv. 31, viii. 26.

*ὃς προσεδέχετο κτλ.*] Like Simeon, ii. 25. It is not necessary to conclude (with Mt.) that he was an actual disciple of Jesus.

52. Lk. agrees with Mt. in omitting to record Pilate's surprise at the early death of Jesus, and his enquiry of the centurion. It is unnecessary to suppose that they did not read the full Marcan text.

53. *λαξευτῷ*] Mk. *ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας*. The adj. *λαξευτός* is not known from elsewhere. *λάξος*

54 Καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν.
55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ, ἐθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον
56 καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, ὑποστρέψασαι δὲ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα καὶ μύρα.

Καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν,
XIV. 1 τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα
2 ἦλθαν φέρουσαι ἃ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα. εὗρον δὲ τὸν

54 *παρασκευης* om D *και σαββατον επεφωσκεν*] *προ σαββατου* D c 55 *αι γυναικες* BLΘ 579 1 etc 69 etc 157 al mu syr.vt aegg: om *αι* ℵACW 700 al mu Eus ⅔: *δυο γυναικες* D 29 lat.vt Eus ⅓ 1 *αρωματα*] add *και τινες συν αυταις* AD al pler f q syrr arm boh (codd) sah ϛ: om ℵBC*L 33 124* latt boh (codd opt): add etiam D c sah *ελογιζοντο δε εν εαυταις τις αρα αποκυλισει τον λιθον* scil e Marc

'a stonemason' is freq. in papyri, and λαξεύω 'to work stone' is found in LXX and prob. in papyri; cf. M.M. *s.v.* Wellh. thinks that Lk. means a tomb made out of hewn stone, but Lk. prob. has no intention of conveying a meaning different from that of Mk.: 'hewn out of the rock.' Such tombs were plentiful outside Jerusalem. Cf. R. A. S. Macalister in Appendix to Gardner-Smith, *The Narratives of the Resurrection.* οὗ οὐκ ἦν κτλ.] Not in Mk. A very natural elaboration of the story, cf. Mt. ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ.

The rolling of the stone against the door of the tomb is supplied in D and some other MSS. from the other Gospels. For the epic description of the size of the stone, added in D, cf. Hom. *Od.* ix. 241.

54. The note of time is transferred from the beginning of the narrative, cf. Mk. xv. 42 καὶ ἤδη ὀψίας γενομένης, ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὅ ἐστιν προσάββατον. ἐπέφωσκεν] The word is here used, not of the literal dawn as apparently in Mt. xxviii. 1 and in Gosp. Pet. ix. 35, but in a transferred sense of the beginning of the Sabbath, i.e. 6 P.M. on Friday evening, cf. Gosp. Pet. ii. 4 (prob. influenced by the language of this verse) εἰ καὶ μή τις αὐτὸν ἠτήκει, ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν ἐθάπτομεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει. γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἥλιον μὴ δῦναι ἐπὶ πεφονευμένῳ. For this usage cf. Turner and Burkitt, *J.Th.S.* xiv. (1913) pp. 188 f., 538 f.

55. αἱ γυναῖκες] Cf. *v.* 49 *supra* n. Mk. (followed by Mt.) names the two Maries. The longer list of three names in Mk. xvi. (om. D k) is perhaps not original. Lk. thinks throughout of a large group of women, cf. viii. 3 and *infra v.* 10. The reading of D lat.vt is a correction.

56. If the women rested on the Sabbath (*v.* 56), and if Jesus was buried 'as the Sabbath drew on,' there can have been little time for the women to prepare the spices. In Mk. the women buy the spices after the Sabbath is passed. Lk.'s modification is probably dictated by literary convenience without too careful consideration of historical exactness.

2-4. Lk. abbreviates and modifies Mk. The questioning of the women on the way to the tomb, as to how the stone is to be moved, disappears.

λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἰσελθοῦσαι δὲ 3
οὐχ εὗρον τὸ σῶμα [τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ]. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν 4
τῷ ἀπορεῖσθαι αὐτὰς περὶ τούτου καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο
ἐπέστησαν αὐταῖς ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ. ἐμφόβων δὲ 5
γενομένων αὐτῶν καὶ κλινουσῶν τὰ πρόσωπα εἰς τὴν γῆν
εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτάς Τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν
νεκρῶν; [οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη.] μνήσθητε ὡς 6
ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὢν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, λέγων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ 7
ἀνθρώπου ὅτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι.

3 του κυριου Ιησου om D a b e ff$^2$ l: [του] Ιησου 42 1071 f syrr 6 ουκ εστιν . . . ηγερθη om D lat. vt (non f q)

The women, finding the stone rolled away, enter the sepulchre at once and themselves discover that the body is absent. The young man in a white robe of Mk. has become two men in shining raiment. We may compare the *two* men in white raiment of Acts i. 10 f. In Mk. 'the young man' is seen by the women immediately on their entry into the tomb.

3. τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ] The first of a series of seven readings in this chapter (*vv.* 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52) which (like xxii. 19b-20) are omitted in D and the Old Latin. Their strong attestation proves them to date from an early period. They are in most cases suspicious on internal grounds, and on the hypothesis that they are original their omission in D lat.vt is—in most of the cases at any rate—inexplicable. The combination ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς is not found in the Gospels, except possibly in [Mk.] xvi. 19.

4. Features characteristic of Lucan style and vocabulary appear when Mark is revised or deserted; note the words ἐπέστησαν, ἐσθῆτι, ἐμφόβων, and the favourite construction καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ . . .

5. ἐμφόβων δὲ . . . εἰς τὴν γῆν] Mk. καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.

5-7. The whole of the angelic address to the women has been recast. οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη is a non-Western insertion from Mt. xxviii. 6 || Mk. xvi. 6. The fundamental change—essential to the whole Lucan conception of the Resurrection appearances—is that instead of charging the women (as in Mk.) with a message to the disciples, recalling to them the prophecy of Mk. xiv. 28 "I will go before you into Galilee" (already omitted by Lk.), the angels are made to recall *to the women* the earlier prophecies of the Passion and Resurrection (ix. 22, 44) made while Jesus 'was yet in Galilee.' The reference to Galilee, though entirely different from that in Mk., is no doubt an echo of the Marcan source. This fundamental change carries with it the modification at the beginning. Instead of the Marcan "Be not amazed; ye seek Jesus . . . He is risen . . ." a slight note of rebuke is introduced: "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" Had they remembered the prophecy of Jesus they would not have done so.

6. ὑμῖν] We must suppose, there-

8 *καὶ ἐμνήσθησαν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι*
9 *[ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου] ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἕνδεκα*
10 *καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς. ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία*
*καὶ Ἰωάνα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου· καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς*
11 *ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα. καὶ ἐφάνησαν*
*ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, καὶ ἠπίστουν*
12 *αὐταῖς. ⟦Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ*
*μνημεῖον· καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα· καὶ ἀπῆλθεν*
*πρὸς αὐτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.⟧*
13 *Καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἦσαν πορευόμενοι*
*εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἰερου-*

9 *απο του μνημειου* om D lat.vt (non f) arm 12 hunc v. om D a b e l Eus ½
13 *εξηκοντα*] praem *εκατον* ℵIKNΠ al syr.hl (txt *vel* mg) pal. hanc lect confirmant ut vid Eus Hier Sozom

fore, that the women were included among the disciples at ix. 18, 43.

8. *ἐμνήσθησαν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ*] Lk. is not sensitive to the psychological difficulty in supposing that the women could, in such circumstances, first forget and then recall a prophecy so detailed.

9. The women do not, as in Mk., flee in terror from the grave and say nothing to any man. They recognise the prophecy which the angel has recalled to them, and return to report what they have heard to the eleven and to the other disciples. *καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς*] This addition prepares the way for *vv.* 22 f. by including others with the eleven.

10. The grammar of this verse is very awkward. The best attested reading can only be made to translate by punctuating (with W.H.) after Ἰακώβου. But this separation of *καὶ αἱ λοιπαί* from the preceding names can scarcely be right. The insertion of *αἳ* before *ἔλεγον* in many MSS. and Textus Receptus is an obvious attempt to mend the text. The difficulty would be eased if we might omit *ἦσαν δέ* with AD syr.vt. So Wellh. and Klostermann. Wellh. thinks this sentence an interpolation. But there is a clear motive for giving the names of the women who had themselves seen the tomb empty and first received and handed on the tidings of the Resurrection.

11. *καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς*] But we learn from *v.* 24 that some of the party went to the tomb and confirmed the report of the women. This perhaps is the beginning of the story of Jo. xx. 3-10, from which, in turn, *v.* 12 has been interpolated into Lk. by all texts except D and the Old Latin.

13. *ἐξ αὐτῶν*] i.e. one of the groups of disciples referred to in *v.* 9. *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*] i.e. the first day of the week.

*εἰς κώμην . . . Ἐμμαούς*] Identified by Eus., Jer., and Soz. with the Emmaus of 1 Macc. iii., iv., later Nicopolis, 176 stadia from Jerusalem in the direction of Joppa. Hence the variant *σταδίους ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα* for *σταδίους ἑξήκοντα* which perhaps goes back to Origen. Nicopolis is obviously too far from Jerusalem to allow of a return

σαλήμ, ᾗ ὄνομα Ἐμμαούς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡμίλουν πρὸς ἀλλή- 14
λους περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων τούτων. καὶ ἐγένετο 15
ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ συνζητεῖν [καὶ] αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς
ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο αὐτοῖς, οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρα- 16
τοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς 17
Τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους
περιπατοῦντες; καὶ ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί. ἀποκριθεὶς 18
δὲ εἷς ὀνόματι Κλεόπας εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Σὺ μόνος
παροικεῖς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ οὐκ ἔγνως τὰ γενόμενα ἐν αὐτῇ

Εμμαους] Ουλαμμαους D: ammaus et cleop[h]as e ff$^2$: cleofas et ammaus b, cf. ad *v.* 18 17 *και εσταθησαν σκυθρωποι* ℵA*(?)B(L) 579 e aegg aeth (cod): *και εστε σκυθρωποι* A$^2$ codd paene omn latt syr.vg arm ς: *σκυθρωποι* D syr.vt aeth Cyr: om pal 18 apud Ambr alter Amaon alter Cleophas dicuntur, cf. ad *v.* 13

journey on the same evening. The place intended is prob. the modern *Kulonieh*, Lat. Colonia, whose ancient name was Emmaus. Cf. Jos. *B.J.* vii. 6. 6 ὀκτακοσίοις δὲ μόνοις ἀπὸ τῆς στρατιᾶς διακειμένοις χώριον ἔδωκεν (Vespasian) εἰς κατοίκησιν, ὃ καλεῖται μὲν Ἀμμαοῦς, ἀπέχει δὲ Ἱεροσολύμων σταδίους τριάκοντα. (One MS. reads ἑξήκοντα. The scribe of this MS. shews elsewhere the influence of the text of the N.T. See Niese, *Pref.* p. xxxix.) Kulonieh is actually 34 stadia (nearly four miles) distant from Jerusalem in the direction of Joppa. The reading of D seems to represent an attempt to identify Emmaus with Bethel. Cf. Gen. xxviii. 19 LXX.

16. οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοί κτλ.] Their vision was dulled: they saw, but did not recognise, the stranger. Contrast *v.* 31.

17. οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε] 'which you exchange with one another.' Cf. 2 Macc. xi. 13 πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιβάλλων τὸ γεγονὸς περὶ αὐτὸν ἐλάττωμα 'turning over in his own mind . . .'

18. ὀνόματι Κλεόπας] A short form for Κλεοπάτρος. Cf. Ἀντίπας—Ἀντίπατρος. See Klostermann for reff. to literature on the name-forms. Κλεόπας is perhaps identical with Κλωπᾶς of Jo. xix. 25. Zahn connects the tradition (Orig. *C. Cels.* ii. 62, 68) that Cleopas's unnamed companion was Simon with the statement in Eus. *H.E.* iii. 11 that the apostles appointed *Simeon, the son of Clopas*, cousin to the Lord, to succeed James as Bishop of Jerusalem. On the other hand, Plummer and others think the name Simon to be a mistaken inference from *v.* 34. In any case it appears not improbable that by Cleopas is intended the father of the Lord's kinsman who was head of the Church at Jerusalem when Luke wrote (cf. Hegesippus *apud* Eus. *H.E.* iii. 32). e and b have transformed the place-name Emmaus into a name for Cleopas's companion. See crit. note, *v.* 13.

σὺ μόνος] μόνος is to be taken with both the two following verbs παροικεῖς and οὐκ ἔγνως, "Are you the only visitor to Jerusalem who has not heard . . . ?" or perhaps παροικεῖς is not literal, but rhetorical, "Are you alone so much of a stranger in Jerusalem that you have not heard . . . ?" Cf. Cic. *Pro Milone* 12. 33 "an vero, iudices, vos soli

19 *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς* Ποῖα; *οἱ*
*δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ* Τὰ *περὶ* Ἰ*ησοῦ τοῦ* Ν*αζαρηνοῦ, ὃς ἐγένετο*
*ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ*
20 *θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, ὅπως τε παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν οἱ*
*ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα θανάτου καὶ*
21 *ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ*
*μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν* Ἰ*σραήλ· ἀλλά γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσιν*
*τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ᾽ οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο.*
22 *ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενόμεναι*
23 *ὀρθριναὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα*
*αὐτοῦ ἦλθαν λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι, οἳ*
24 *λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν. καὶ ἀπῆλθάν τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν*
*ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ εὗρον οὕτως καθὼς αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον,*
25 *αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον. καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς* Ὦ
*ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς*
26 *ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται· οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χρι-*

ignoratis, vos hospites in hac urbe versamini, vestrae peregrinantur aures ?" and other exx. in Wettstein.

19. *ἐγένετο*] Not a mere copula, "who had shewn himself to be . . ." *ἀνὴρ προφήτης*] They had known Jesus as a prophet, mighty in word and deed, and what had happened since did not disturb their belief in his prophetic mission. He was not the first prophet to be put to death. But they had hoped that he was to be more than a prophet—'he who should redeem Israel,' i.e. the Christ. It was this expectation which the Crucifixion had shattered.

20. The guilt is again laid upon the rulers of the Jews.

21. *τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει*] It is very harsh to make ὁ Ἰησοῦς the subject of *ἄγει* (so Zahn and E. Meyer). The construction must be impersonal (so Blass, § 30. 4), 'it is now the third day.' The dialogue must not be pressed. Why should it be emphasised that three days have passed since the catastrophe, unless, prior to the discovery of the empty tomb, some miracle had been expected to follow? The sentence makes a transition to the account of the visit of the women to the sepulchre. Wellh. thinks that *vv.* 22-24 are not original. But they help to link this narrative to the preceding, and *v.* 21 demands a sequel (note *σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις* which suggests that more remains to be told); and without *vv.* 22-24 the rebuke of *v.* 25 loses its point.

26. *οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν*] The necessity for Christ's death is founded upon the prophecies of Scripture, cf. xviii. 31 *καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.* The Christ must needs die before he could enter upon his glory. Except in Paul's speech at Miletus (Ac. xx. 28) Lk. does not pass beyond this somewhat external view of the necessity of the Passion. He is not at home in the Pauline ideas of the Cross

στὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; καὶ ἀρξάμενος 27
ἀπὸ Μωυσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν
αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. Καὶ 28
ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο, καὶ αὐτὸς προσεποιήσατο
πορρώτερον πορεύεσθαι. καὶ παρεβιάσαντο 29
αὐτὸν λέγοντες Μεῖνον μεθ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν
ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλικεν ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι
σὺν αὐτοῖς. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν 30
μετ' αὐτῶν λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπεδίδου
αὐτοῖς· αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ 31
ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ αὐτὸς ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν.
καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη 32
ἦν ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς

32 καιομενη] κεκαλυμμενη D c e l sah: was heavy syrr arm sah (cod) ην] add εν ημιν ℵA codd paene omn: om BD c e vg(cod T) syr.vt Orig ως ελαλει ημιν om c e syr.vt Orig Ambr Aug

and redemption. He nowhere affirms an inner relationship between the necessity of the cross and the forgiveness of sins. εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν] It is to be noted that emphasis falls upon the glorification of Christ at the Resurrection and remains there. The Parousia is not the centre of hope and faith.

27. ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωυσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν] A zeugma. He began with Moses and went on through all the prophets.

29. The lateness of the hour is urged as a reason why the unknown traveller should not journey farther. The idea so often read into the words that Christ is invited to stay with his disciples in the perils and dangers of darkness is foreign to the context.

30. The blessing and breaking of the loaf recalls a characteristic action of Jesus in his lifetime, cf. ix. 16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ. The association of the appearance of Christ risen with the breaking of bread is highly significant. Here is the connecting link between ix. 16 and Ac. ii. 42, 46. The two disciples had not been present at the Last Supper, cf. xxii. 14 f. notes. Here, as in Acts, there is no mention of wine.

31. ἄφαντος] Here only in N.T. Frequent in Gk. lit. of a supernatural disappearance, e.g. Eur. *Hel.* 605 βέβηκεν ἄλοχος σὴ πρὸς αἰθέρος πτυχὰς | ἀρθεῖσ' ἄφαντος, οὐρανῷ δὲ κρύπτεται, and other exx. in Wettst. Cf. also 2 Macc. iii. 34 (the two angels who appeared to Heliodorus) ταῦτα δὲ εἰπόντες ἀφανεῖς ἐγένοντο.

32. καιομένη] For the metaphor cf. Ps. xxxviii. 4. καιομένη is generally accepted as the right reading (but not by Blass). The variants perhaps arose from a misunderstanding of the metaphor (cf. W.H. *Select Readings*, p. 72).

33 *γραφάς;* *Καὶ ἀναστάντες αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ὑπέστρεψαν*
*εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ εὗρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς*
34 *ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντας ὅτι ὄντως ἠγέρθη*
35 *ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.* *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ*
*ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ*
36 *ἄρτου.* *Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων αὐτὸς ἔστη*

34 λεγοντας] λεγοντες D

33-35. The disciples return to Jerusalem at once with their news and, on their arrival, are anticipated by the announcement that the Lord is risen indeed and has appeared to Simon. This is the only possible interpretation of the usual text. We must suppose that the appearance to Peter took place some time between the journey of the disciples to the tomb (referred to in *vv.* 22 f.) and the return of the two disciples to Emmaus. This indirect introduction of the appearance to Peter is closely parallel to the indirect account of the visit of the disciples to the tomb (*v.* 24). The terror and surprise of the disciples at the appearance of Jesus (*vv.* 37, 41) are indeed hardly in harmony with the view that they were already convinced of the truth of the Resurrection. The discrepancy may be accounted for if *vv.* 36-43 are based upon an earlier narrative which has not been entirely assimilated to its present position. In *v.* 34 D reads λέγοντες. This reading has been preferred by some critics. By ascribing *v.* 34 to the two disciples instead of to the apostles, the incoherence already noted is removed. The two disciples then say: we now know that the Lord is really risen and that his appearance to Simon may be believed (so Klostermann tentatively). But this is hardly tolerable as an interpretation of ὤφθη Σίμωνι, even if we suppose that the appearance to Peter and not the empty tomb was the original presupposition of the Emmaus narrative (*vv.* 22-24 being on this theory an interpolation). Even less acceptable is the suggestion that the Simon of *v.* 34 was the companion of Cleopas. Loisy prefers λέγοντες, and conjectures that Σίμωνι has replaced an original ἡμῖν. Perhaps the weightiest objection to the ordinary interpretation is that [Mk.] xvi. 12, 13, though almost certainly dependent upon Lk. xxiv., says of the eleven that when they heard of the appearance of Jesus from the two disciples οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπίστευσαν. This is directly contrary to *vv.* 33-35 if we read λέγοντας. But even if we read λέγοντες [Mk.]'s categorical statement that they disbelieved is not supported by Lk., and is at best an impression derived from *vv.* 36 f. It may be conjectured that an impression from *vv.* 36, 41 created the unsupported statement of [Mk.] xvi. 13. We conclude, then, that there is no sufficient reason to question the ordinary text.

36-43. Jesus appears to the disciples, who are terrified at what they take to be a spirit. He convinces them that it is he himself, risen bodily, by shewing to them his hands and his feet. He then eats before them. There are close resemblances, both in language and context, to the narrative of the appearance to the apostles in Jo.

*ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν [καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν]. πτοηθέντες* 37
*δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θέωρεῖν. καὶ* 38
*εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί τεταραγμένοι ἐστέ, καὶ διὰ τί δια-*
*λογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν; ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς* 39
*μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός· ψηλαφήσατέ*
*με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς*
*ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. [καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς* 40
*χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας.] Ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ* 41
*τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἔχετέ τι βρώ-*
*σιμον ἐνθάδε; οἱ δὲ ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ μέρος·* 42

36 *και λεγει . . . υμιν* codd et verss paene omn ς : add etiam GP al pauc c f g$^{1.2}$ vg syrr(vg.hl) pal arm boh (codd) Ambr Aug *εγω ειμι μη φοβεισθε* cf. Jo. vi. 20 : om D a b e ff$^{2}$ l 40 *και τουτο . . . ποδας* om D a b e ff$^{2}$ l syr.vt 42 *μερος*] add *και απο μελισσιου κηριου* codd paene omn latt syrr(exc.sin) boh Cyr-Hier ς : om ℵABDWLΠ e syr.sin sah boh (codd) Clem Orig Eus Epiph Cyr al

xx. 19 f., which is not improbably dependent upon this passage. Here, as at *v.* 12, the Johannine text has itself in turn influenced the Lucan. The non-Western insertions in *vv.* 36 and 40 are taken from Jo. xx. 19, 20. (*τὴν πλευράν* Jo. is replaced in Lk. by *τοὺς πόδας* to harmonise with *v.* 39. The piercing of Christ's side is not related in Lk.)

37. The terror of the disciples is perhaps an indication that in the original setting of the story the disciples (? in Galilee) had not been prepared for the event by the discovery of the empty tomb. *ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν*] The intention of meeting possible explanations of the appearances, as being those of a disembodied spirit, is very pronounced. Cf. Ignat. *Smyrn.* iii. *ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα· καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον* (acc. to Jerome a quotation from *Gospel acc. to Hebrews*, but Origen quotes "non sum daemonium incorporeum" from the *Teaching of Peter*, cf. Lightfoot *ad loc.*). *καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι . . . μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν, ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί.*

39. *πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει*] Cf. Hom. *Od.* xi. 218 f. *ἀλλ᾽ αὕτη δίκη ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε τίς κε θάνῃσιν· | οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἶνες ἔχουσιν, | ἀλλὰ τὰ μέν τε πυρὸς κρατερὸν μένος αἰθομένοιο | δαμνᾷ ἐπεί κε πρῶτα λίπῃ λεύκ᾽ ὀστέα θυμός, | ψυχὴ δ᾽ ἠΰτ᾽ ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται.*

41-43. A further proof of the corporeal reality of the risen Lord. If the original scene of this appearance was by the lake-side in Galilee, it would be very natural that fish should be at hand. We may also note a similarity in wording between *v.* 41 and Jo. xxi. 5 (the appearance by the Sea of Galilee), *λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς Παιδία, μή τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε;* which may point to a common source behind the two narratives. Cf. also Jo. xxi. 9, where

43 καὶ λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν. Εἶπεν δὲ
44 πρὸς αὐτούς Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς
ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα
ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ Ψαλμοῖς
45 περὶ ἐμοῦ. τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι

43 εφαγεν] add KΠΘ 13-346 al pauc c vg syrr(cur.hl) arm pal boh (codd) aeth Athan Epiph Aug και τα επιλοιπα εδωκεν αυτοις vel similia

fish is cooked at a coal fire on the seashore and afterwards distributed with bread by Jesus to the disciples. The interpolation at the end of *v.* 43 may be due to subsequent influence of Jo. xxi. 13 upon the text. Cf. also Acts x. 41. Nothing is known as to the origin of the early addition to *v.* 42. Loisy suggests a connexion with the early practice of giving milk and honey to the newly baptized.

44 f. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς] It is not quite clear how closely Luke intends to connect this charge with the preceding narrative. It is most natural to suppose that he still has the same occasion in mind, and that Jesus leads the disciples out to Bethany (*v.* 50) at the end of his talk with them. If so, Luke cannot have thought out the chronology. It was 'towards evening' when the disciples reached Emmaus. It must have been late before they had completed the return journey. If, therefore, the concluding paragraphs are to be thought of as immediately consecutive, the final scene at Bethany must have taken place at night or early morning. But of this there is no indication. Perhaps, as Loisy says, the perspective in these last verses is meant to be vague. According to Acts i. 3 Jesus appeared to the disciples and taught them concerning the kingdom of God over a period of forty days. No such precise period is mentioned in the Gospel, but "the author has certainly not intended to signify that the instructions had been completed at midnight eighteen hours after the Resurrection and half-an-hour before the Ascension." It is certain that *v.* 51 is meant for the final parting. This is definitely implied in Acts i. 2, and Acts i. 6 f. must be taken for a fuller account of the same event. The content of the charge reflects the theology and the historical perspective of the Gentile Church in the later decades of the century. The scientific foundation is the appeal to O.T. Scriptures. The prophecies contained therein have been fulfilled by the death and resurrection of Jesus. In the name of Jesus Christ repentance unto remission of sins is to be proclaimed to the world —beginning from Jerusalem. The apostles are the accredited witnesses to Christ, and Christ is to endue them with the Spirit which the Father has promised. The expectation of the end is left in the background. The leading thought is the victorious expansion of the Church under the guidance of the Spirit.

44. οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου] οὗτοι is the subject attracted to agree with the predicate οἱ λόγοι. The meaning is: 'these events (my death and resurrection) explain the words which I spoke . . .'

οὓς ἐλάλησα] ix. 22, 44, xvii. 25, xviii. 31 f., xxii. 37.

καὶ Ψαλμοῖς] This is the only place in the N.T. where the Psalms are mentioned alongside the Law

τὰς γραφάς. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται πα- 46
θεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφε- 47
σιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,—ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερου-
σαλήμ· ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω 48 49
τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθ-
ίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.
Ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἕως πρὸς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἐπάρας 50
τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ 51
εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ⟦καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς
τὸν οὐρανόν⟧. καὶ αὐτοὶ ⟦προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν⟧ ὑπ- 52

47 *εις αφεσιν* ℵB syr.vg aegg: *και αφεσιν* codd et verss paene omn *αρξαμενοι* ℵBC*LNX 33 syr(hl.mg) aegg aeth: *αρξαμενων* D b f ff$^2$ q vg: *αρξαμενον* A al pler a c e l arm ϛ: *αρξαμενος* SΘ 565 49 *του πατρος* om D e *μου* om a 51 *και ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον* om ℵ*D a b e ff$^2$ l syr.sin Aug ⅓ 52 *προσκυνησαντες αυτον* om D a b e ff$^2$ l syr.sin Aug

and the Prophets. The Psalms provided the greater part of the Messianic texts: cf. esp. for the Passion Pss. xxii., lxix.; for the Resurrection Pss. ii., xvi., cx.

46-48. ἀρξάμενοι stands outside the construction and almost has the force of an adverb. A close parallel occurs in Acts x. 37 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. The variants are no doubt attempts to improve the grammar. Wellh. proposes to take κηρυχθῆναι outside the government of γέγραπται and to regard it as the equivalent of the Hebrew infin. with Lamed in a jussive sense. This would go better with ἀρξάμενοι, but it would require us to read ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου (with syr.sin). On the other hand it is difficult in Greek to give κηρυχθῆναι a different construction from παθεῖν and ἀναστῆναι, and it is good Lucan doctrine that the proclamation of repentance to all nations is foretold in prophecy. Cf. Ac. x. 43, xiii. 47, and *supra* ii. 32.

49. The omission of τοῦ πατρός in D e is perhaps a correction under the influence of John xv., xvi. (So Zahn.) Wellh. thinks that D e may give the original reading, but Jesus has not in this Gospel himself promised the Spirit. It was spoken of by Jesus (Ac. i. 4), but promised by the Father (Ac. i. 4, ii. 39) through Joel (Ac. ii. 17). Jesus when exalted fulfils the Father's promise (Ac. ii. 33).

51, 52. καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν—προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν] The omission of these words in D lat.vt syr.sin (supported in the case of the former clause by the original hand in ℵ) makes it probable that they are interpolations of the same character as the doubtful readings in *vv.* 4, 6, 12, 37, and 40. So W.H., Plummer, Blass, Wellh., J. Weiss, Klostermann. Streeter defends the originality of the former clause, arguing that it may have been omitted to remove an apparent chronological contradiction between the Gospel and Acts (*Four Gospels*, pp. 142 f.). So also Zahn. For προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν cf. Mt. xxviii. 17.

53 *ἔστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης, καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν.*

53 *ευλογουντες* ℵBC*L syr.sin pal aegg: *αινουντες* D a b e ff$^{2}$ l: *αινουντες και ευλογουντες* A codd paene omn c f q vg syrr(vg.hl) arm ϛ

The event here described is not to be distinguished from the *ἀνάλημψις* (ix. 51). This is clear from the Gospel itself as well as from the definite statement in the summary reference to the Gospel at the beginning of Acts (i. 1-2) *τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε, ὧν ἤρξατο Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις . . . ἀνελήμφθη*. But it is fitting at the end of the Gospel to portray the departure of Christ as the close of the personal intercourse between Jesus and the disciples. Hence the restraint of the language (*διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν*). At the same time the note of joyful expectancy with which the book ends prepares for what is to follow. In Acts it is equally appropriate to treat the departure in a different aspect—viz. as the exaltation of Christ, on which the gift of the Spirit and the victorious progress of the Church depend. When the books were separated in the Church's Canon it may be surmised that a more emphatic conclusion to the Gospel was felt to be desirable, and the same editor's hand which supplemented the account of the Last Supper from St. Paul and harmonised the Resurrection narratives with those of the other Gospels has also amplified the text of these last verses to include a direct statement of the Ascension into heaven. We may compare the end of [Mark] xvi. 9-20.

53. The Gospel ends, as it began, in the courts of the Temple.

# ADDITIONAL NOTES

## MAGNIFICAT AND BENEDICTUS

These two hymns are both but loosely connected with the narrative. They both celebrate the redemption of God's people. The language of each is closely modelled upon the Old Testament, as will appear from the following tables of parallels (which I take from Klostermann):

### Magnificat (i. 46-55)

| | |
|---|---|
| 46 Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν Κύριον<br>47 καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου· | ἡ δὲ ψυχή μου ἀγαλλιάσεται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ, τερφθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ σωτηρίῳ αὐτοῦ Ps. xxxiv. 9.<br>ἐστερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν Κυρίῳ . . . ἐν θεῷ μου 1 Regn. ii. 1.<br>ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ ἀγαλλιάσομαι, χαρήσομαι ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου Hab. iii. 18. |
| 48 ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ, | ἐὰν ἐπιβλέπων ἐπιβλέψῃς τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης σου 1 Regn. i. 11.<br>ἀγαλλιάσομαι . . . ὅτι ἐπεῖδες τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου Ps. xxx. 8.<br>διότι εἶδέν μου Κύριος τὴν ταπείνωσιν Gen. xxix. 32. |
| ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί· | μακαρία ἐγώ, ὅτι μακαρίζουσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γυναῖκες Gen. xxx. 13. |
| 49 ὅτι ἐποίησέν μοι μεγάλα ὁ δυνατός, | ὅστις ἐποίησεν ἐν σοὶ τὰ μεγάλα Deut. x. 21. |
| καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, | ἅγιον καὶ φοβερὸν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ps. cx. 9. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 50 καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεάς<br>τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν. | τὸ δὲ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος<br>ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν Ps. cii. 17. |
| 51 ἐποίησεν κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ,<br>διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν· | δεξιὰ Κυρίου ἐποίησεν δύναμιν Ps. cxvii. 15.<br>σὺ ἐταπείνωσας . . . ὑπερήφανον<br>καὶ ἐν τῷ βραχίονι τῆς δυνάμεώς σου διεσκόρπισας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου Ps. lxxxviii. 11. |
| 52 καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων καὶ ὕψωσεν ταπεινούς,<br>53 πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐξαπέστειλεν κενούς. | Κύριος πτωχίζει καὶ πλουτίζει,<br>ταπεινοῖ καὶ ἀνυψοῖ.<br>ἀνιστᾷ ἀπὸ γῆς πένητα . . .<br>καθίσαι μετὰ δυναστῶν λαῶν<br>καὶ θρόνον δόξης κατακληρονομῶν αὐτοῖς 1 Regn. ii. 7 f.<br>θρόνους ἀρχόντων καθεῖλεν ὁ κύριος<br>καὶ ἐκάθισεν πρᾳεῖς ἀντ᾽ αὐτῶν Ecclus. x. 14.<br>ἐξαποστέλλων ἱερεῖς αἰχμαλώτους<br>δυνάστας δὲ γῆς κατέστρεψεν Job xii. 19.<br>ὕψωσας τὸ ταπεινόν Ez. xxi. 26.<br>ψυχὴν πεινῶσαν ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν Ps. cvi. 9. |
| 54 ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ<br>μνησθῆναι ἐλέους, | σὺ δέ, Ἰσραήλ, παῖς μου . . . οὗ ἀντελαβόμην Is. xli. 8 f.<br>ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰακώβ Ps. xcvii. 3. |
| 55 καθὼς ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν,<br>τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. | . . . ἔλεον τῷ Ἀβραάμ, καθότι ὤμοσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν κτλ. Mic. vii. 20.<br>τῷ Δαυεὶδ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος 2 Regn. xxii. 51. |

### Benedictus (i. 68-79)

| | |
|---|---|
| 68 Εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, | εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ὁ θεὸς (τοῦ) Ἰσραὴλ Ps. xl. 14; lxxi. 18; lxxxviii. 53; cv. 48. |
| . . . ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ. | λύτρωσιν ἀπέστειλεν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ Ps. cx. 9. |
| 69 καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυεὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, | ἐκεῖ ἐξανατελῶ κέρας τῷ Δαυείδ Ps. cxxxi. 17.<br>ἀνατελεῖ κέρας παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ Ez. xxix. 21.<br>ὑψώσει κέρας Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ 1 Regn. ii. 10. |
| . . . . . . | |
| 71 σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς, | ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρῶν μισούντων<br>καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθροῦ Ps. cv. 10 (xvii. 18). |
| 72 ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν | ἔλεον τῷ Ἀβραάμ, καθότι ὤμοσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν Mic. vii. 20. |
| καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ, | ἐμνήσθη τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ Ps. cv. 45.<br>ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ τῆς πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ Ex. ii. 24.<br>ἐμνήσθη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διαθήκης αὐτοῦ Ps. civ. 8. |
| 73 ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, | λόγου οὗ ἐνετείλατο εἰς χιλίας γενεάς κτλ. Ps. civ. 9.<br>ὅπως στήσω τὸν ὅρκον μου, ὃν ὤμοσα τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν Jer. xi. 5. |
| 74 τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας | τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι Jer. xi. 5.<br>λέγων· σοὶ δώσω τὴν γῆν Χανάαν Ps. civ. (cv.) 11. |
| λατρεύειν αὐτῷ . . . | |
| 76 . . . . . . | |
| προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ | καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου Mal. iii. 1.<br>ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου Is. xl. 3. |
| . . . . . | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 79 ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις, | οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χώρᾳ (καὶ) σκιᾷ θανάτου φῶς λάμψει ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς Is. ix. 2.<br>καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου Ps. cvi. 10 (Is. xlii. 7). |
| τοῦ κατευθῦναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης. | ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ οἴδασιν Is. lix. 8. |

Harnack argues that they, like the rest of these chapters, were composed by the evangelist himself. Others find it easier to think that they originated in a Jewish or Jewish-Christian environment, where the art of hymn-writing (cf. e.g. *Psalms of Solomon*, c. 60 B.C., and, to some extent, *Odes of Solomon*) still lived. It is difficult to reach a certain conclusion on linguistic grounds; but if Luke took them over from some other source, he has almost certainly himself retouched the language.

In spirit and in idea the hymns are in keeping with the ancient prophetic tradition. The promises made to the patriarchs are to be fulfilled to Israel through the house of David. Conceptions of the Resurrection and of a heavenly Messiah are absent. The redemption is described in each psalm in a series of aorists (*vv.* 51-54, 68-69). The aorists have been interpreted in the Magnificat of God's mighty deeds in days of old (J. Weiss) or else as a timeless expression (like the Hebrew Perfect) of what God does. But they are better taken with Gunkel (*Harnack-Festgabe*, 1921, p. 54) as anticipations of a future redemption, which is prophetically regarded as having already happened. Gunkel classes the two hymns with a group of the Psalms (xlvi., xlvii., xlviii., lxxvi., xcviii., cxlix.) which he characterises as 'eschatological.' They were written, he thinks, by a Jewish hand, but they have been Christianised. Verse 48 in the Magnificat is a Christian interpolation designed to make the hymn relevant to the occasion; similarly Gunkel holds that the concluding verses (76-79) of the Benedictus are not original. They are a direct prophecy of the future, and are in conflict with the point of view of 'the eschatological hymn,' which may be said to look back upon what in reality is yet to come. The history of the Magnificat on this theory affords a close parallel to the history of Hannah's song, 1 Sam. ii. 1. In both cases a song of national deliverance has been put by a later editor into the mouth of a Hebrew mother exulting over her son.

The question, however, arises whether it is not more probable that 1 Sam. ii. 1 f. directly suggested to the evangelist, or to the author of his source, the idea of such a song in this particular place. The canticle contains scarcely any original material, and may well have been put together by the evangelist, as it stands, on the basis of the LXX. Similarly the Benedictus in the main closely follows O.T. language, and where, as in *vv.* 70, 73-75, it follows a line of its own, internal characteristics of style seem to render it probable that it was written in Greek and by the evangelist. The transition from 'eschatological prophecy' in the opening verses to direct prophecy at *v.* 76 is not difficult. The prophetic speaker opens with a thanksgiving for the redemption which is prophetically regarded as complete, and then turns to the child who is to herald and prepare its appearance.

## LYSANIAS, TETRARCH OF ABILENE

According to Lk. iii. 1, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, i.e. A.D. 29, a certain Lysanias was tetrarch of Abilene. Nothing is known for certain of this ruler from ancient sources, and it has been supposed by many scholars [1] that Luke's statement is erroneous.

It is well known that a Lysanias succeeded his father Ptolemaeus in the year 40 B.C. as lord of a substantial principality which had its capital at Chalcis. The principality contained the plain of Massyas, between Libanus and Anti-Libanus, reaching as far north as Laodicea. Southward it probably included Panias (later Caesarea Philippi) and Ulatha, near the Waters of Merom.[2] Abila and the surrounding country fell within the principality. The wild Iturean and Arabian subjects of the lords of Chalcis were a perpetual menace to their lowland neighbours the Damascenes.[3] Ptolemaeus followed an independent policy, embracing the cause of the Jewish nationalists against Hyrcanus and the Romans in 49 B.C. He gave asylum to Antigonus and other members of the family of Aristobulus, and himself married Alexandra, daughter of Aristobulus.[4] Lysanias continued his father's policy, and helped Antigonus to secure the aid of the Parthians when they invaded Syria.[5] His independence was his ruin. M. Antonius put him to death in 34 B.C. at the request of Cleopatra on the ground of his intrigues with the Parthians, and his kingdom fell to Cleopatra.[6] It is recorded by Josephus that at some later date a certain Zenodorus 'purchased the house of Lysanias.'[1] Whether, however, Zenodorus acquired the whole of the former territory of Lysanias is perhaps doubtful. In 23 B.C. he was compelled by Augustus to cede to Herod Trachon, Batanea, and Auranitis, on the ground that he was unable to restrain the pillaging of their lawless inhabitants, and on his death three years later at Antioch Augustus assigned his remaining territory, 'Ulatha, Panias, and the surrounding district' to Herod. It may be conjectured that this was the territory of Lysanias which he had purchased. We hear nothing of Chalcis, the old capital, or of Abilene. The northern part of the old principality perhaps became a separate domain, for we learn from an inscription[2] that Q. Aemilius Secundus, a lieutenant to Quirinius, undertook an expedition against the Itureans. At a much later date we find an Iturean kingdom in existence, which was granted in the year A.D. 38 by Caligula to a certain Soemus.[3] On his death in A.D. 49 the territory was included in the province of Syria.[4] The territory of Soemus probably consisted of the northern division of the old kingdom of Ptolemaeus and Lysanias, southwards from Laodicea.

---

[1] Among others by H. J. Holtzmann, Schmiedel, Burkitt, Wellhausen.

[2] Strabo xvi. pp. 753, 755. That the principality included Panias and Ulatha is a probable inference from the story of Zenodorus (Jos. *Ant.* xv. 10. 3). See below.

[3] Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 15. 2; 16. 3; *B.J.* i. 4. 8; 5. 3; Strabo *l.c.*

[4] *Ant.* xiv. 7. 4.

[5] *Ib.* xiv. 13. 3.

[6] *Ib.* xv. 4. 1; Porphyrius *apud* Euseb. *Chron.* i. 170, where read *Λυσανίου* for *Λυσιμάχου*; Dio Cass. xlix. 32.

The history of Abilene remains obscure until the year A.D. 53, when Josephus records that it was added by Claudius, together with Trachonitis, to the kingdom of Agrippa II. Josephus adds: "Now this (i.e. Abila) had been the tetrarchy of Lysanias."[5] Again in *Ant.* xix. 5. 1 he speaks of *Ἄβιλαν τὴν Λυσανίου* and *B.J.* ii. 11. 5 *ἑτέραν βασιλείαν τὴν Λυσανίου καλουμένην*. It has been supposed that the Lysanias referred to in these passages by Josephus is the well-known Lysanias who was executed by M. Antonius, and that his old kingdom retained his name. It has been further suggested that Luke was misled by these statements in Josephus, and wrongly inferred the existence of a Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene, in the earlier decades of the first century prior to the cession of Abila to Agrippa II. Now Abila had undoubtedly been included in the old kingdom of Lysanias, but it was not the capital town. It seems strange that Abilene should have been known as 'the kingdom of Lysanias,' merely because it formed part of a kingdom which in fact was far more extensive. The language of Josephus is better explained if we postulate a second Lysanias, who actually ruled at Abila as tetrarch at some

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xv. 10. 1 *Ζηνόδωρός τις ἐμεμίσθωτο τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Λυσανίου*; *B.J.* i. 20. 4. Zenodorus was perhaps son of Lysanias of Chalcis, cf. *C.I.G.* 4523 (quoted Schürer, *G.J.V.* i. p. 715, n. 30 . . . *θυγάτηρ Ζηνοδώρῳ Λυσ[ανίου τ]ετράρχου καὶ Λυσ[ανίᾳ]*).

[2] *C.I.L.* t. iii. Suppl. 6687 (quoted Schürer, *G.J.V.* i. p. 720) "Missu Quirini adversus Ituraeos in Libano monte castellum eorum cepi."

[3] Dio Cass. lix. 12.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23.

[5] *Ant.* xx. 7.

period between the death of Lysanias, son of Ptolemaeus, and the year A.D. 53. This second Lysanias is probably the man referred to in two extant inscriptions. *C.I.G.* 4523 (quoted above) mentions a Lysanias together with 'Zenodorus of Lysanias the tetrarch,' thus proving the existence of two men who bore the name 'Lysanias,' both probably of the same family. That the second Lysanias was actually tetrarch of Abilene in the reign of Tiberius is rendered highly probable by *C.I.G.* 4521 [1] discovered at Abila :

> Ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν κυρίων Σε[βαστῶν]
> σωτηρίας καὶ τοῦ σύμ[παντος]
> αὐτῶν οἰκοῦ, Νυμφαῖος . . .
> Λυσανίου τετράρχου ἀπελε[ύθερος]
> τὴν ὁδὸν κτίσας κτλ.

The plural κυρίων Σε[βαστῶν] brings the inscription down to the reign of Tiberius, when, for the first time, the Empire was ruled by more than one Augustus.[2] It remains possible that Nymphaeus was emancipated as a child by the elder Lysanias of Chalcis some half a century before,[3] but it is far more probable that we have a reference to a younger Lysanias who was tetrarch of Abilene in the reign of the emperor Tiberius.

It is therefore reasonable to suppose that Luke's statement that a Lysanias ruled over Abilene at the time of the ministry of John the Baptist is true, and that when Josephus spoke of Abilene as the former 'kingdom' or 'tetrarchy' of Lysanias he referred to this man, and not to his more famous namesake.[4]

A further consequence of this conclusion is that Luke's reference to Lysanias, being probably correct, does not suggest the hypothesis of a mistaken inference from Josephus, and does not support the conjecture that Luke knew Josephus. On the contrary this is one of several cases in which Luke draws upon sources of information independent of Josephus.

## THE BAPTISM OF JOHN

Lustrations are widespread in the religious practice of mankind. To wash is the obvious means whereby to rid oneself of 'uncleanness,' if 'uncleanness' is mainly a matter of physical condition, and the same act may very readily be regarded as an effectual sacrament whereby moral guilt is thought to be washed away.

---

[1] Quoted Schürer, i. p. 718, n. 42.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* i. 8 "Livia in familiam Iuliam nomenque Augustum adsumebatur."

[3] See Schmiedel, art. 'Lysanias,' *Ency. Bibl.*

[4] So Schürer (followed by Klostermann); Paully-Wissowa, xiii. 2. 2507, and, very confidently, E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, i. p. 48.

In the pagan Graeco-Roman world various lustral washings are known to have been practised. A rite of washing was a preliminary to initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries, and likewise in the mysteries of Isis and of Mithras. We need not dwell on these lustral rites. They shew that the idea of a ritual washing would be familiar in the ancient world apart from the baptism associated with the newly-born Christian Church and with John 'the Baptist,' but it would be quite fanciful to look for any direct influences from these quarters upon the historical beginnings of the Christian rite. Moreover, the analogy between these rites and baptism as attested by most of the N.T. documents is but slight. The mystery washings were preparatory ablutions, in no case, as it seems, identified with the actual initiation,[1] and far less prominent in the whole economy of the mystery than was baptism in the early Church.

We need not look beyond Judaism for the practice of rites of washing. In the Pentateuch washings are prescribed for the removal of ceremonial defilements (Lev. xi.-xv., Num. xix.), and later Judaism had extended the principle. Thus in *Jubilees* xxi. 16 careful instructions are given to wash hands and feet before and after sacrifice (cf. also *Test. XII. Patr.*, Levi, ix. 11). From Josephus (*B.J.* ii. 8. 5) we learn that the Essenes practised a daily 'purification' by bathing in cold water. The ascetic Bannus, with whom Josephus according to his own account (*Vita*, 2) spent three years before he was nineteen, affords in many respects a close parallel to John. He lived in the desert, Josephus tells us, and used no other clothing than what grew on the trees, and ate only what grew of itself. He also frequently bathed himself in cold water, both day and night, in order to preserve his sanctity.

A closer analogy to John's baptism is to be found in the rite of baptism as administered to Gentile proselytes. There is no quite conclusive evidence that this rite was in force in the first half of the first century. Early in the second century we have the clear testimony of Epictetus who distinguishes the man who has become an entire convert to Judaism, in contrast to a waverer, as one "who has been baptized (βεβαμμένου) and made his choice" (*Dissert.* ii. 9). The Mishna[2] prescribes sacrifice, circumcision, and baptism for the admission of proselytes, and since sacrifice could no longer in practice be performed after the destruction of the Temple, it is probable that the Mishnaic ordinance dates back to before A.D. 70. Moreover, there is strong *a priori* probability that a Gentile would be required to undergo a purification from the defilement of his former manner of life before he was admitted to the commonwealth of Israel.

---

[1] See especially Apul. *Met.* xi. 23, where the sacred bath is prior to and separate from the consummation of the initiation, and cf. A. D. Nock, 'Early Gentile Christianity' in *Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation*, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson, pp. 112 f.

[2] See Abrahams, *Studies*, 1st series, p. 37.

These various lustral rites shew that a baptism would not in itself be strange to Jewish contemporaries of John and Jesus. At the same time they do not encourage the supposition that John's baptism was simply taken over from existing practice. The title by which John was known, 'the Baptizer' (Mk.) or 'the Baptist' (the Gospels and Josephus), seems to shew that the baptism which he administered was felt to be distinctive. Unlike the usual washings prescribed in the law, and the lustrations of the Essenes and of Bannus, the baptism of John was performed once and for all.[1] It was not intended to free from ceremonial defilement, nor was it an ascetical practice; it is distinguished as a 'baptism of repentance.' Again, unlike the baptism of proselytes, John's baptism was preached within the heart of Judaism and was administered to genuine Israelites. It was not a rite of admission to the People of God, but a rite of preparation for the judgement to come. The baptism of John, as it is represented in the Gospels, finds its place and its explanation in an apocalyptic context. We may perhaps look for the sources of the idea in prophetic texts such as Isaiah i. 16, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, Zech. xiii. 1.

Our accounts are too fragmentary to enable us to decide whether the act of baptism was thought of as symbolic, or as being in some way directly efficacious. The question implies a distinction which arises inevitably in the mind of an 'enlightened' European. It was probably present in the mind of Josephus. But for John the Baptist himself such a question should probably not be asked. It is at any rate sound criticism to underline the statement that John preached a baptism *of repentance*. Only those who had turned to God could escape the wrath to come (cf. Mal. iii., iv.).

Beside the Gospels we possess an independent *Testimonium* to John and his baptism in the *Antiquities* of Josephus (xviii. 5. 2). The authenticity of the passage has been questioned, but it does not appear to be open to serious doubt.[2] The account is the more interesting in that it describes John's work without any reference to Christianity. There are some significant divergences from the Christian narratives, but in the main Josephus agrees with the evangelists. After recounting the defeat of Herod Antipas by Aretas in the war which had arisen over Herod's divorce of his wife, the daughter of Aretas, Josephus relates that the defeat was supposed by some to be a divine visitation upon Herod for his execution of John the Baptist. John, says Josephus, was a good man, who exhorted the Jews to exercise virtue (*ἀρετή*) by practising both justice (*δικαιοσύνη*) towards one another and piety (*εὐσέβεια*) towards God, and to come to baptism. For baptism would be acceptable to God if they used it, not for the pardon of certain sins, but for the purification of the body, provided that the soul had been thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Josephus continues to relate that the popularity of John's preaching alarmed Herod Antipas, so that, fearing a popular rising, he seized John and sent him in chains to Machaerus, where he had him put to death. This account of John's ministry agrees with the Gospels in representing John as administering baptism, and as concerning himself in his teaching with conduct. It differs (1) in passing over John's prophecy of divine judgement and of the mightier one to come, and (2) in declaring that the baptism was concerned with purification of the body, and not with forgiveness of sins.

---

[1] In Clem. *Hom.* ii. 23 John the Baptist is converted into a Hemerobaptist. In the same passage Simon Magus is said to have been the chief of his disciples.

[2] Cf. Abrahams, *Studies*, 1st series, pp. 30 f.

There seems good reason to assume that the Gospels give, on the whole, a true impression of what John actually preached. The prophecy of the coming one, 'whose fan is in his hand,' is not likely to have been invented in the Christian Church, for it contains nothing to suggest the peculiar character and fate of the Christian Messiah. On the other hand the distinctive features in Josephus's version may be explained from the historian's manifest desire to commend his history to an educated Gentile public. He wishes to place John in a favourable light and to interpret his mission in terms which would be generally intelligible. He therefore drops the apocalyptic note and makes John an ethical and religious teacher such as the Greek world would understand and reverence.[1] Josephus's interpretation of the baptism may be similarly explained as a rationalising account of John's rite. John did not, Josephus would explain, adopt the unethical view that a washing could itself remove sins; he prescribed a washing as a *bodily* purification, it being understood that the soul had been already cleansed by righteousness; righteousness alone can cleanse the soul, and the washing with water is a physical counterpart in the physical sphere. A similar combination of words and ideas is found in Philo's idealised account of the purifications which, he says, preceded in ancient days the solemn drinking of wine: *πρότερον γὰρ εὐξάμενοι καὶ θυσίας ἀναγαγόντες καὶ ἱλασάμενοι τὸ θεῖον, σώματα καὶ ψυχὰς καθηράμενοι, τὰ μὲν λουτροῖς, τὰ δὲ νόμων καὶ παιδείας ὀρθῆς ῥεύμασιν, φαιδροὶ καὶ γεγηθότες πρὸς ἀνειμένην δίαιταν ἐτρέποντο.*[1] The treatment of the Christian rite of baptism in Heb. x. 22, so different in its emphasis from the Pauline texts, appears to be controlled by the same line of thought: *ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ.*

---

[1] Abrahams (*op. cit.* p. 34) notes that Josephus describes John's teaching in terms which closely resemble his version of the Essene rule of life (*B.J.* ii. 8. 7), and he concludes that Josephus clearly "means to identify John with that sect." But Josephus does not otherwise hint at the identification, and had he regarded John as an Essene, there seems no reason why he should not have said so directly. If the interpretation of Josephus adopted above is correct, little weight, so far as history is concerned, should be laid upon the coincidence in language.

In conclusion, we may note that Josephus's own statement that Herod apprehended John in fear of political dangers is more easily explained if John proclaimed the advent of a Messianic judge and judgement, as the Gospels represent, than if he was merely a preacher of ascetic piety.[2]

---

[1] Philo, *De plantatione Noe*, i. 354 M., quoted Brandt, *Jüdische Baptismen*, p. 90; cf. also Dibelius, *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*, p. 125, and E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, i. p. 88, n. 4.

[2] The synoptic Gospels and Josephus are the only authorities for the mission of John the Baptist which call for serious consideration as historical sources. The interpolations in the Slavonic version of Josephus are curious documents of uncertain date, which may embody popular Jewish traditions about John and Jesus. The first three deal with John the Baptist. John's mission is made contemporary with Archelaus's rule, and there are improbabilities of other kinds. For a German translation of the fragments cf. Frey, *Der slavische Josephusbericht über die urchristliche Geschichte*, Dorpat, 1908, and for an English translation from the German, G. R. S. Mead, *The Gnostic John the Baptizer*, 1924.

The attempt is also made to extract information as to the community of John's disciples in the first century, and even as to John's own teaching from the Mandaean literature. The subject is too large to discuss here, but it may be said that Reitzenstein's attempt to prove a Mandaean text to be prior to Q is slenderly based (*Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse, und die Evangelienüberlieferung*, 1919, pp. 59 f., cf. E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, ii. p. 407). Bultmann (*Z.N.T.W.* 24 (1925), p. 144) will not follow Reitzenstein in his argument for the dependence of the Gospels upon the Mandaean text, yet he thinks that this literature may be used as evidence for the beliefs of the community of John's disciples at Ephesus, that the fourth Gospel borrowed ideas and language from John's disciples, and that a Gnostic-Baptist type of religion may lie behind both the disciples of John and the disciples of Jesus; in other words, as he puts it, that a 'Johannine' type of thought and piety may be early Palestinian and antedate the 'synoptic,' the latter representing a Judaising reaction. This appears to be an improbable conjecture. Reference should be made to an article by Prof. Burkitt (*J.Th.S.*, April 1928) in which he shews that the use of the Bible in the Mandaean literature as a whole presupposes the Syriac version. In any case the plea holds good that we ought not to over-ride the testimony of good and early sources by precarious inferences from documents, which, as they stand, presuppose a late and developed form of Christianity.

Moreover, it may be urged that while it is not difficult to conceive of an

## THE APPEARANCE OF THE RISEN JESUS TO THE DISCIPLES

The present text of the Gospel according to Mark (apart from the conclusion, xvi. 9-20, which certainly comes from another hand) contains no narrative of an appearance of Jesus after his crucifixion. Only the discovery of the empty tomb by the women on the first day of the week is recorded. But an appearance of Jesus to the Apostles in Galilee is certainly implied by Mark, and perhaps an especial appearance to Peter as well (see xvi. 7). It is thought probable by many critics that the original text of St. Mark's Gospel has been mutilated, and that the original recorded the appearance referred to in the angel's words to the women. It seems, however, improbable that St. Mark's Gospel ever included such a narrative, and improbable that the Gospel was ever longer than it is now, for it is hard to see how Mark could have advanced from the statement at the end of the present text to an account of the appearance in Galilee.[1] If such a narrative ever stood at the end of Mark, we should expect to find it connected with the angel's message to the disciples that they were to go into Galilee. But Mark says expressly that " the women said nothing to any man, for they were afraid." It follows—though this is not said in so many words—that the women did not deliver the message to the disciples. The unqualified statement of the silence of the women is very remarkable after the charge of ' the young man ' ; but that statement being once made, it is hard to imagine how the evangelist could have proceeded to relate that the message was actually delivered, unless we assume that his narrative included some very cumbersome explanation.[2] On the theory, therefore, that there was a sequel, it would seem better to conjecture that the narrative made a fresh start with the disciples, and related their vision of the Risen Jesus independently of the preceding narrative of the empty tomb and the angelic message. Yet then the undelivered message remains as an awkward superfluity. These difficulties are avoided if we assume, with Wellhausen and E. Meyer, that the original Mark always ended, as it does now, with *v.* 8 ;

---

apocalyptic prophet being appropriated after his death by a Gnosticising movement, it is much harder to imagine how an original Gnosticising movement came to be transformed into the apocalyptic mission of synoptic tradition.

[1] Cf. E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, i. pp. 17 f. ; Lyder Brun, *Die Auferstehung Christi* (Oslo, 1925), p. 11.

[2] Various suggestions as to how, on the theory of mutilation, the last sentence of Mark may have been completed will be found in Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 268. Apart from the difficulty in constructing a plausible theory as to how the document came to be mutilated, these suggestions all seem to give a very weak sense. The present text is powerful and characteristic of Mark ; cf. ix. 6, x. 32.

and an explanation of the surprising silence of the women is forthcoming if we assume, again with Wellhausen and E. Meyer, that the angelic message of *v.* 7 is not an original element in the story of the women at the tomb. If the story is read without that verse we have a coherent narrative : the women are told by the angelic messenger that Jesus is risen and are shewn the empty grave. They flee in fear, and tell no man, for they are afraid. The concluding sentence is abrupt as a conclusion to the Gospel (yet not much more abrupt than its beginning), but it is a good conclusion to the paragraph. It may have been intended in the original form of the story to explain how it came about that the story of the empty tomb was not widely known among Christians, or it may have explained how it was that the disciples were not convinced of the Resurrection before the appearance in Galilee. But the words of the angel "Go tell his disciples . . .," though not on this theory an original part of the narrative of the empty tomb, are an original part of the text of Mark. The appearance in Galilee is probably implied in xiv. 28, and it may be supposed to have been a familiar tradition. With a reserve which is not without parallel elsewhere, Mark avoids a direct relation of the appearance, and introduces it indirectly into the narrative which he has taken over (xvi. 1-9). We may perhaps suppose that Mark had not realised that his narrative makes the women fail to carry out a plain direction.[1]

The difficulty of the Marcan narrative, however, has struck both Matthew and Luke, as it was bound to strike any writer who tried to expand the Marcan text to include an account of the appearance. Mk. xvi. 7, "Go tell his disciples . . .," now controls the development of the tradition. According to Matthew the women, in obedience to the angelic bidding, run away rejoicing to tell the disciples. On the way they meet Jesus who himself repeats the bidding that the disciples should go to Galilee. In Luke, indeed, the angelic message that the disciples should go to Galilee disappears. But in its place we have an address of the angels to the women in which they explain the empty tomb by recalling to the women the words which Jesus had spoken while he was yet in Galilee, and the women on their return relate their experience to the disciples. The disciples at first disbelieve, but before the day is ended they have seen the Lord in Jerusalem. Thus both Matthew and Luke have completed the process already begun in Mark of linking in a connected narrative the tradition of the empty tomb and the tradition of the appearance of the Risen Jesus to the disciples. But the last words of Mark still remain to testify that originally the two traditions were distinct. The women "said nothing to any man." The resurrection faith did not start with them, but with the disciples to whom Jesus appeared. The story of the empty tomb was a welcome confirmation of a faith which was already established.

---

[1] Cf. *J.Th.S.*, Jan. 1930.

According to Luke and John the Lord appeared to the Apostles on the evening of the first day of the week in Jerusalem, and Luke excludes by implication the idea that they ever left Jerusalem before Pentecost (xxiv. 49, 52-53). Mark, on the other hand, followed by Matthew, places the appearance to the disciples in Galilee. There is no reasonable doubt that from a literary point of view Luke is secondary to Mark. The sequence of events on Easter Day, as reconstructed by Luke, is an artificial composition which has been carried through by drastic editing of the Marcan source. It is natural to suspect that the Marcan tradition of an appearance in Galilee is not only earlier, but also closer to the facts. This indeed is the opinion of most critics, and the present writer shares it. It is, however, possible that though from the point of view of the transmission of tradition Luke represents a secondary editing of Mark, he has nevertheless rightly edited Mark into closer conformity with historic fact. Such a theory to be convincing must not only shew reason for thinking that the Lucan and Johannine conception is intrinsically more probable, but also provide some explanation of the rise of the Galilean tradition.

Two recent attempts to vindicate the Jerusalem tradition against the Galilean may be mentioned.

Johannes Weiss (*Urchristentum*, pp. 10 f.) thinks that the meaning of the fundamental text, Mk. xiv. 27 f., has been misunderstood. Why should Jesus not have manifested himself in Jerusalem ? Was it necessary that he should go to Galilee before he could be seen ? And if the first appearance took place in Galilee, how is it that we hear nothing of the return to Jerusalem ? The proper translation of Mk. xiv. 28, according to Weiss, is not 'I will go before you into Galilee' but 'I will lead you forth into Galilee.' Whether or not the saying is a genuine saying of Jesus, it is very ancient tradition, and the real purpose of the expected journey was not that the disciples might see Jesus there, but that they, with him at their head, might there await the coming kingdom. But the Lord never did lead them forth to Galilee ; therefore the prophecy was either dropped, as in Luke and John, or else transformed, as by Mark (xvi. 7)—and modern critics—into a prophecy that the disciples will see the Lord in Galilee. This misunderstood saying is the basis not only of

Mk. xvi. 7 and Mt. xxviii. 16 f., but also of Jn. xxi. and the appearance recorded in the lost conclusion of the Gospel of Peter. In actual fact the Apostles stayed in Jerusalem, as John and Luke relate.

A somewhat similar interpretation of the evidence has been suggested by Professor Burkitt (*Christian Beginnings*, pp. 78 f.). Is it not remarkable, Burkitt asks, that the first appearance should have taken place in Galilee, when Galilee played so small a part in early Christian history ? And why is it that we hear nothing of the return of the disciples to Jerusalem ? It must of course be recognised that Mark records a prophecy that the disciples will see Jesus in Galilee, and it might be thought that he must have gone on to relate (in the lost conclusion) how that prophecy was fulfilled. But, Burkitt suggests, Mark might have gone on to explain why this appearance did *not* take place in Galilee. The explanation may have been that Peter started for Galilee, but before he had travelled far on the road he beheld his Lord and forthwith returned to Jerusalem, where we afterwards find him as the recognised head of the early Christian Church. Thus Professor Burkitt goes further than Weiss in that he is not prepared to allow it as certain that Mark is a sure witness for the Galilean tradition. The account of the Galilean appearance in Matthew may be discounted, as Matthew knew only the mutilated Mark and naturally drew the same (and probably mistaken) conclusion from Mk. xvi. 7 as modern critics have done.

But we may ask whether Matthew's conclusion is not inevitable. Is it conceivable that Mark would have allowed an angel to say " There (in Galilee) ye (the Apostles) shall see him, as he said to you," if he did not accept a tradition that in fact they did so ?

It is clearly not possible for us to reconstruct with any security an account of the movements of the disciples after ' they forsook him and fled ' in the garden of Gethsemane (Mk. xiv. 50). We need not conclude that they fled forthwith to Galilee, and it may be that there is good tradition preserved in the Gospel of Peter where it represents the Apostles as remaining in Jerusalem ' weeping and grieving ' until the end of the Feast (cf. Gardner-Smith, *Narratives of the Resurrection*, pp. 110 f., 144 f.). With regard to the appearance to the disciples, if we take our start from the contradictory traditions in the Gospels, it seems not difficult to account for a tendency to transfer to Jerusalem appearances which really took place in Galilee. On the other hand it is hard to see what motive would be likely to encourage the opposite tendency—unless J. Weiss's suggestion of the misinterpretation of Mk. xiv. 28 commends itself as a sufficient cause. I cannot think that a tradition which must have been widely accepted (cf. John xxi.; Gospel of Peter) is adequately accounted for by the supposed misunderstanding.

Parallel to, and independent of, the tradition of the Galilean appearance was the story of the empty tomb at Jerusalem. As that story gained an increasing significance for the Church, it reacted upon the tradition of the appearances. There was a natural tendency to locate the appearance of Jesus near, both in time and place, to the empty tomb—more particularly as Jerusalem remained in fact the centre of the Christian Church. In Matthew the Galilean tradition held its own, but it is supplemented by a clearly secondary narrative of an appearance to the women as they leave the tomb. In Luke and John the empty tomb and the appearances to the Apostles have been thrown into close juxtaposition. Even so there are elements in Luke's account of the appearance to the disciples which perhaps betray an original setting by the Sea of Galilee (cf. xxiv. 41 f. n.).

## ST. LUKE AND ST. JOHN

Although the Gospel according to St. Luke is in the main a redaction of traditional material, and falls into the same class with the other 'synoptic' Gospels, nevertheless certain general characteristics peculiar to Luke shew an approximation to the Gospel according to St. John both in theological attitude and in the general treatment of the history.

(1) The weakening of emphasis upon the imminence of the Parousia in Luke (cf. Introd. p. lxxii), and the heightening of teaching upon the gift of the Holy Spirit,[1] both represent tendencies which move towards the Johannine conception of the Parousia. But the full Johannine doctrine of the Parousia is not attained in Luke. The return of the Son of Man is confidently anticipated as a future temporal event. Moreover in Luke the gift of the Spirit remains a promise until after the Resurrection appearances have ceased; it is not directly bestowed on Easter Day by the risen and ascended Christ as in St. John.

(2) The amount of space in St. Luke devoted to the Galilean ministry is proportionately less than in St. Mark (or in St. Matthew, cf. Mt. xix. 1 with Lk. ix. 51). The same tendency to reduce the Galilean ministry appears in John. John also, like Luke, records a ministry in schismatical Samaria. Again, Luke transfers the appearance of the Risen Christ from Galilee to Jerusalem and confines the Resurrection appearances to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood.

---

[1] Lk. xi. 13, xii. 12, and esp. xxiv. 48 f.

This is in agreement with Jn. xx., though Jn. xxi. returns to the Galilean tradition.

These wide similarities probably represent reactions to the same changing tendencies in feeling, interest, and perspective. Motives which have more lightly touched the work of Luke have become stronger in the mind of John, and have contributed to an entirely fresh presentation and interpretation of the life and work of Jesus. It would be an obvious exaggeration to attribute the peculiar characteristics of the Johannine Gospel to the direct literary influence of Luke.

It appears, however, to be almost certain that John knew and used Luke. A considerable number of verbal similarities, as well as other points of contact, can only be accounted for on the supposition either that John used Luke or that they both drew upon some common source or sources. In some cases the conclusion that John knew the Gospel text as we have it seems to be almost inevitable, and this may probably be taken to be the true explanation of the rest.[1]

(1) Both Luke and John introduce the sisters Martha and Mary, who are not mentioned in the other Gospels. The characterisations of the sisters in the two Gospels correspond. John probably knew the story of Lk. x. 38-42. (Cf. Jo. xii. 1 f.)

(2) John identifies the woman who anointed Jesus at Bethany (Mk. xiv.) as the sister Mary. The Johannine narrative is mainly founded on Mark, but John was certainly also familiar either with Lk. vii. 36 f.—and this seems the more probable view—or else with the version of the anointing which Luke here reproduces. Cf. notes *ad loc.*

(3) Lazarus, the brother of Martha and Mary, appears in John only. It is possible that the name was directly suggested by Luke xvi. 19 f., and probable that there is relation of some kind between Lk. xvi. 31 and Jo. xi. See on Lk. xvi. 31.

(4) In describing the betrayal of Jesus, Luke says (xxii. 3) that "Satan entered into Judas." John appears to have caught up this idea. At xiii. 2 he says that "the devil had already put it into the heart of Judas to betray Jesus" and at *v.* 27 he says that "after the sop Satan entered into him." This is the only occurrence of the name Satan in St. John's Gospel. The resemblance to Luke is close. Since the sentence "Satan entered into Judas," though peculiar to Luke of the synoptists, occurs in a context which in general

---

[1] Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, 'Das schriftstellerische Verhältnis d. Joh. zu den Synoptikern,' *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theologie*, 1869, pp. 69 f.; Harnack, *Luke the Physician* (E.T.), pp. 224 f.; Moffatt, *Introd. to N.T.* pp. 534 f.

is indubitably Marcan, there is a very high probability that John is here echoing the actual text of Luke.

(5) Luke and John both give fuller accounts of the Last Supper than the other evangelists, and in some respects they agree against Mark.

(*a*) John has omitted entirely the blessing and distribution of the bread and wine. In Luke the words at the giving of the cup are attenuated and the sacrificial language disappears.

(*b*) The scene of the feet-washing, which is peculiar to John, recalls the saying, "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth," which is peculiar to Luke. The saying is perhaps the original source of the Johannine narrative.

(*c*) Both Luke and John place the prediction of Peter's denial at the Supper itself, whereas Mark (and Matthew) place it after the Supper. Moreover the wording of Jo. xiii. 38 is very close to Lk. xxii. 34, both Luke and John differing in the same way from Mk. xiv. 30.

The verbal agreement last mentioned makes it highly probable that John knew the Lucan account of the Supper.

(6) At the narrative of the arrest, John, like Luke, relates that it was the *right* ear of the high priest's servant that was cut off.

(7) In the account of the trial before Pilate, John (xix. 12) like Luke (xxiii. 2) emphasises the political character of the charge preferred against Jesus, and, like Luke, states that Pilate *thrice* declared Jesus innocent (Lk. xxiii. 4, 14, 22; Jo. xviii. 38, xix. 4, 6).

(8) John agrees with Luke against Mark in saying that there were *two* angels at the tomb on Easter morning.

(9) In the account of the appearance to the disciples on the evening of Easter Day, John agrees with Luke in these points:

(*a*) Jesus appears suddenly in the midst of the disciples;

(*b*) Jesus shews his body to the disciples (hands and feet, Luke; hands and side, John).

(*c*) He speaks to the disciples concerning the forgiveness of sins.

(*d*) The invitation to Thomas (Jo. xx. 27) recalls the invitation to the disciples in Luke to 'handle' the Lord's body.

(10) There is clearly some relationship between the account of the miraculous draught of fishes in Luke v. and that in Jo. xxi., but direct dependence upon Luke in this case seems unlikely. See the special introduction to Luke v. 1 f.

Other points of likeness between the two Gospels are that in Luke xii. 4 as in Jo. xv. 14 Jesus speaks of his disciples as φίλοι. In Luke (ii. 11, cf.

also Acts v. 31, xiii. 23) Jesus is σωτήρ, and brings σωτηρία (i. 69, 71, 77, xix. 9); cf. Jo. iv. 22, 42; 1 Jo. iv. 14. Luke's use of ὁ κύριος of Jesus in narrative reappears occasionally in John.

Lastly, we may note that some of the personal names in John shew signs of contact with traditions otherwise peculiar to Luke. Luke (iii. 2; Acts iv. 6) and John (xviii. 13, 24) alone refer to Annas. John ascribes a question to 'Judas, not Iscariot' (xiv. 22); this will be 'Judas of James' whose name is peculiar to the Lucan lists of the Twelve. Luke associates Peter and John (xxii. 8, cf. Acts i. 13, iii. 1 f., iv. 13, 19, viii. 14), as John associates Peter and 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (xviii. 15, xx. 3, xxi. 20).

# INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

A single asterisk denotes that the word is found in the New Testament only in the third Gospel and in Acts.

Two asterisks denote that the word is found in the New Testament in the third Gospel alone.

Ἀαρών, i. 5
Ἀβειληνή, iii. 1
Ἄβελ, xi. 51
Ἀβιά, i. 5
Ἀβραάμ, i. 55, 73, iii. 8, 34, xiii. 16, 28, xvi. 22 f., xix. 9, xx. 37
ἄβυσσος, viii. 31
ἀγαθοποιέω, vi. 9, 33, 35
ἀγαθός, καλὸς καί, viii. 15
ἀγαλλίασις, i. 14, 44
ἀγαλλιάω, i. 47, x. 21
ἀγανακτέω, xiii. 14
ἀγαπάω, vi. 27 f., vii. 5, 42, 47, x. 27, xi. 43, xvi. 13
ἀγάπη, xi. 42
ἀγαπητός, iii. 22, ix. 35, xx. 13
ἄγγελος, i. 11 f., 26 f., ii. 9 f., iv. 10, vii. 24, 27, ix. 26, 52, xii. 8 f., xv. 10, xvi. 22, [xxii. 43], xxiv. 43
ἀγέλη, viii. 32 f.
ἁγιάζω, xi. 2
ἅγιος, i. 35, 49, 70, 72, ii. 23, iv. 34, ix. 26
  ἅγιον πνεῦμα, i. 15, 35, 41, 67, ii. 25, 26, iii. 16, 22, iv. 1, x. 21, xi. 13, xii. 10, 12
**ἀγκάλη, ii. 28
ἀγνοέω, vi. 45
ἀγορά, vii. 32, xi. 43, xx. 46
**ἄγρα, v. 4, 9
**ἀγραυλέω, ii. 8
ἀγρυπνέω, xxi. 36
**[ἀγωνία], xxii. 44
ἀγωνίζομαι, xiii. 24
Ἀδάμ, iii. 38
ἄδηλος, xi. 44
ᾍδης, x. 15, xvi. 23
ἀδικία, xiii. 27, xvi. 8 f., xviii. 6
ἄδικος, xvi. 10 f., xviii. 11
ἀδυνατέω, i. 37
ἀδύνατος, xviii. 27
ἀετός, xvii. 37
ἄζυμος, xxii. 1, 7
ἀθετέω, vii. 30, x. 16
**ἀθροίζω, xxiv. 33
αἰνέω, ii. 13, 20, xix. 37, [xxiv. 53]
**αἰσθάνομαι, ix. 45
αἰσχύνη, xiv. 9
αἰσχύνομαι, xvi. 3
αἴτημα, xxiii. 24
*αἴτιον, xxiii. 4, 14, 22
αἰφνίδιος, xxi. 34
αἰχμαλωτίζω, xxi. 24
αἰών, i. 33, 55, 70, xvi. 8, xviii. 30, xx. 34 f.
αἰώνιος, x. 25, xvi. 9, xviii. 18, 30
ἀκαταστασία, xxi. 9
ἀκοή, vii. 1
ἀκριβῶς, i. 3
ἀλέκτωρ, xxii. 34, 60 f.
ἄλευρον, xiii. 21
ἀλήθεια, ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας, iv. 25, xx. 21, xxii. 59
ἀληθινός, xvi. 11
ἀλήθω, xvii. 35
**ἀλλογενής, xvii. 18
ἀλλότριος, xvi. 12
ἅλων, iii. 17
ἀλώπηξ, ix. 58, xiii. 32
ἄμεμπτος, i. 6
ἀμήν, iv. 24, xii. 37, xviii. 17, 29, xxi. 32, xxiii. 43
ἄμπελος, xxii. 18
**ἀμπελουργός, xiii. 7
ἀμπελών, xiii. 6, xx. 9 f.
**ἀμφιάζω, xii. 28
ἀμφιέννυμι, vii. 25
ἀναβαίνω, ii. 42
ἀνάγαιον, xxii. 12
ἀναγκάζω, xiv. 23
*ἀνάγομαι ('to put out to sea'), viii. 22
*ἀναδείκνυμι, x. 1
**ἀνάδειξις, i. 80
ἀναζάω, xv. 24
*ἀναζητέω, ii. 44 f.

**ἀνάθημα, xxi. 5
**ἀναιδία, xi. 8
*ἀνακαθίζω, vii. 15
ἀνακάμπτω, x. 6
ἀνακλίνω, ii. 7
ἀνακρίνω, xxiii. 14
ἀνακύπτω, xiii. 11, xxi. 28
**ἀνάλημψις, ix. 51
ἀναλίσκω, ix. 54
ἀναλύω, xii. 36
**ἀνάπειρος, xiv. 13, 21
ἀναπέμπω, xxiii. 7, 11, 15
ἀνάπτω, xii. 49
*ἀνασπάω, xiv. 5
**ἀνατάσσομαι, i. 1
ἀνατολή, i. 78, xiii. 29
*ἀνατρέφω, iv. 16
*ἀναφαίνω, xix. 11
**ἀναφωνέω, i. 42
Ἀνδρέας, vi. 14
**ἀνέκλειπτος, xii. 33
**ἀνένδεκτος, xvii. 1
*ἀνευρίσκω, ii. 16
**ἀνθομολογέομαι, ii. 38
Ἄννα, ii. 36
Ἄννας, iii. 2
ἀνόητος, xxiv. 25
ἄνοια, vi. 11
ἀνορθόω, xiii. 13
ἀνταποδίδωμι, xiv. 14
ἀνταπόδομα, xiv. 12
ἀνταποκρίνομαι, xiv. 6
*ἀντεῖπον, xxi. 15
ἀντί, ἀνθ' ὧν, i. 20, xii. 3, xix. 44
**ἀντιβάλλω, xxiv. 17
**ἀντικαλέω, xiv. 12
ἀντιλαμβάνομαι, i. 54
ἀντιλέγω, ii. 34, xx. 27
**ἀντιμετρέομαι, vi. 38
**ἀντιπαρέρχομαι, x. 31 f.
**ἀντίπερα, viii. 26
ἄνωθεν, i. 3
ἀπαιτέω, vi. 30, xii. 20
ἀπαλλάσσω, xix. 12
**ἀπαρτισμός, xiv. 28
**ἀπελπίζω, vi. 35
*ἀπογραφή, ii. 2
ἀπογράφομαι, ii. 1 f.
*ἀποδέχομαι, viii. 40, ix. 11
**ἀποθλίβω, viii. 45
**ἀποκλείω, xiii. 25
ἀπολογέομαι, xii. 11, xxi. 14
ἀπολύτρωσις, xxi. 28
**ἀπομάσσομαι, x. 11
**ἀπορία, xxi. 25
ἀποσπάω, xxii. 41
ἀπόστολος, vi. 13, ix. 10, xi. 49, xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10
**ἀποστοματίζω, xi. 53
ἀποτελέω, xiii. 32
*ἀποτινάσσω, ix. 5
**ἀποψύχω, xxi. 26
**ἀρήν, x. 3
ἀριστάω, xi. 37
**ἄροτρον, ix. 62
**ἀστράπτω, xvii. 24, xxiv. 4
ἀσφάλεια, i. 4
**ἀσώτως, xv. 13
**ἄτεκνος, xx. 28 f.
**ἄτερ, xxii. 6, 35
Αὔγουστος, ii. 1
αὐλίζομαι, xxi. 37
**αὐστηρός, xix. 21 f.
**αὐτόπτης, i. 2
**ἄφαντος, xxiv. 31
ἄφεσις, i. 77, iii. 3, iv. 18, xxiv. 47
ἀφορμή, xi. 54
**ἀφρός, ix. 39
**ἀφυπνόω, viii. 23
ἀχάριστος, vi. 35
ἀχρεῖος, xvii. 10
ἄχυρον, iii. 17

βάθος, v. 4
**βαθύνω, vi. 48
**βαθέως, xxiv. 1
**βαλλάντιον, x. 4, xii. 33, xxii. 35 f.
βαπτίζω, iii. 7 f., vii. 29 f., xi. 38, xii. 50
βάπτισμα, iii. 3, vii. 29, xii. 50, xx. 4
βαπτιστής, vii. 20, 33, ix. 19
βάπτω, xvi. 24
Βαραββᾶς, xxiii. 18
Βαρθολομαῖος, vi. 14
βασανίζω, viii. 28
βάσανος, xvi. 23, 28
βάτος, vi. 44, xx. 37
**βάτος (Hebr. *bath*), xvi. 6
Βεεζεβούλ, xi. 15 f.
**βελόνη, xviii. 25
Βηθανία, xix. 29, xxiv. 50
Βηθλεέμ, ii. 4, 15
Βηθσαιδά, ix. 10, x. 13
Βηθφαγή, xix. 29
βιάζομαι, xvi. 16
βίος, viii. 14, xv. 12, 30, xxi. 4
βιωτικός, xxi. 34
βλάπτω, iv. 35
**βλητέον, v. 38
**βολή, xxii. 41
βορρᾶς, xiii. 29
βουλεύομαι, xiv. 31
βουλευτής, xxiii. 50
βουλή, vii. 30, xxiii. 51
**βουνός, iii. 5, xxiii. 30
**βραδύς, xxiv. 25
βραχίων, i. 51
βραχύς, xxii. 58
βρέφος, i. 41 f., ii. 12 f., xviii. 15
**βρώσιμος, xxiv. 41
βυθίζω, v. 7
βύσσος, xvi. 19

Γαβριήλ, i. 19, 26
**γαμίσκομαι, xx. 34
γάμος, xii. 36, xiv. 8
γε, xi. 8, xviii. 5, xxiv. 21 ; εἰ δὲ μήγε, v. 36, 37, x. 6, xiii. 9, xiv. 32
γέεννα, xii. 5
γείτων, xiv. 12, xv. 6, 9
**γελάω, vi. 21, 25
γένεσις, i. 14
γένημα, xii. 18, xxii. 18
γέννημα, iii. 7
Γεννησαρέτ, v. 1
Γερασηνός, viii. 26, 37
**γῆρας, i. 36
γίνομαι, see i. 8 n.
  ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ c. Infin. i. 8, ii. 6, iii. 21, v. 1, 12, viii. 40, ix. 18, 29, 33, 51, x. 38, xi. 1, 27, xiv. 1, xvii. 11, 14, xviii. 35, xix. 15, xxiv. 4, 15, 30, 51
  μὴ γένοιτο, xx. 16
γνωρίζω, ii. 15, 17
γνῶσις, i. 77, xi. 52
γνωστός, ii. 44, xxiii. 49
γογγύζω, v. 30
γονεῖς, ii. 27 f., viii. 56, xviii. 29, xxi. 16
γράμμα, xvi. 6, 7
γραφή, iv. 21, xxiv. 27, 32, 45
γρηγορέω, xii. 37, 39

**δακτύλιος, xv. 22
δάκτυλος, xi. 20, 46, xvi. 24
δανίζω, vi. 34 f.
**δανιστής, vii. 41
δαπανάω, xv. 14
**δαπάνη, xiv. 28
Δαυείδ, i. 27, 32, 69, ii. 4, 11, iii. 31, vi. 3, xviii. 38 f., xx. 41 f.
δέησις, i. 13, ii. 37, v. 33
δεκτός, iv. 19, 24
δεσπότης, ii. 29
**†δευτερόπρωτος†, vi. 1
δή, ii. 15
δηνάριον, vii. 41, x. 35, xx. 24
διαβαίνω, xvi. 26
**διαβάλλω, xvi. 1
διαβλέπω, vi. 42
διάβολος, iv. 2 f., viii. 12
διαγγέλλω, ix. 60
**διαγογγύζω, xv. 2, xix. 7
**διαγρηγορέω, ix. 32
διαδίδωμι, xi. 22, xviii. 22
διαθήκη, i. 72, [xxii. 20]
διαιρέω, xv. 12
**διακαθαίρω, iii. 17
διακονέω, iv. 39, viii. 3, x. 40, xii. 37, xvii. 8, xxii. 26 f.
διακονία, x. 40
**διαλαλέω, i. 65, vi. 11
**διαλείπω, vii. 45
διαμαρτύρομαι, xvi. 28
διαμένω, i. 22, xxii. 28
διαμερίζω, xi. 17 f., xii. 52 f., xxii. 17, xxiii. 34
**διαμερισμός, xii. 51
**διανεύω, i. 22
**διανόημα, xi. 17
**διανυκτερεύω, vi. 12
διαπεράω, xvi. 26
*διαπορέω, ix. 7
**διαπραγματεύομαι, xix. 15
**διασείω, iii. 14
διαστρέφω, ix. 41, xxiii. 2
**διαταράσσομαι, i. 29
*διατηρέω, ii. 51
διατίθεμαι, xxii. 29
**διαφυλάσσω, iv. 10 (=Ps. xc. 11 LXX)
**διαχωρίζομαι, ix. 33
διερμηνεύω, xxiv. 27
**διήγησις, i. 1
*διΐστημι, xxii. 59, xxiv. 51
*διϊσχυρίζομαι, xxii. 59
δικαιοσύνη, i. 75
δικαιόω, vii. 29, 35, x. 29, xvi. 15, xviii. 14
δικαίωμα, i. 6
*διοδεύω, viii. 1
διότι, i. 13, ii. 7, xxi. 28
διχοτομέω, xii. 46
δόγμα, ii. 1
δοκιμάζω, xii. 56, xiv. 19
δοκός, vi. 41 f.
δοξάζω, iv. 15 ; δοξάζω τὸν θεόν, ii. 20, v. 25, 26, vii. 16. xiii. 13, xvii. 15, xviii. 43, xxiii. 47
*δούλη, i. 38, 48
δοῦλος, ii. 29, and freq.
**δοχή, v. 29, xiv. 13
**δραχμή, xv. 8, 9
δυνάστης, i. 52
δύνατος, i. 49, xiv. 31, xviii. 27, xxiv. 19
**δυσβάστακτος, xi. 46 (in Mt. xxiii. 4 om. W.H. text)
δυσμή, xii. 54, xiii. 29

**ἔα, iv. 34
**ἐδαφίζω, xix. 44
**ἐθίζω, ii. 27
ἔθος, i. 9, ii. 42, xxii. 39
εἶδος, iii. 22, ix. 29
εἰσάγω, ii. 27, xiv. 21, xxii. 54
εἰσακούω, i. 13
ἑκατοντάρχης, vii. 2 f., xxiii. 47
ἐκδικέω, xviii. 3, 5
ἐκδίκησις, xviii. 7, 8, xxi. 22
ἐκδύω, x. 30
ἐκζητέω, xi. 50, 51
**ἐκκομίζω, vii. 12
ἐκκόπτω, iii. 9, xiii. 7, 9

**ἐκκρέμομαι, xix. 48
ἐκλέγομαι, vi. 13, x. 42, xiv. 7
ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, ix. 35
ἐκλείπω, xvi. 9, xxii. 32, xxiii. 45
ἐκλεκτός, xviii. 7, xxiii. 35
ἐκμάσσω, vii. 38, 44
**ἐκμυκτηρίζω, xvi. 14, xxiii. 35
ἐκπειράζω, iv. 12, x. 25
ἐκπνέω, xxiii. 46
ἔκστασις, v. 26
**ἐκτελέω, xiv. 29, 30
ἐκτενῶς, [xxii. 44]
ἐκφεύγω, xxi. 36
**ἐκχωρέω, xxi. 21
ἐλεημοσύνη, xi. 41, xii. 33
Ἐλεισάβετ, i. 5 f.
ἔλεος, i. 50, 54, 58, 78; ποιεῖν ἔλεος, i. 72, x. 37
Ἐλισαῖος, iv. 27
**ἑλκόομαι, xvi. 20
ἕλκος, xvi. 21
ἐλπίζω, vi. 34, xxiii. 8, xxiv. 21
**ἐμβάλλω, xii. 5
Ἐμμαούς, xxiv. 13
ἐμπίμπλημι, i. 53, vi. 25
ἔμφοβος, xxiv. 5, 37
*ἔναντι, i. 8
*ἐναντίον, i. 6, xx. 26, xxiv. 19
ἐνγράφομαι, x. 20
**ἐνδέχομαι, xiii. 33
ἐνδιδύσκω, xvi. 19
ἔνδοξος, vii. 25, xiii. 17
*ἐνεδρεύω, xi. 54
**ἔνειμι, xi. 41
ἐνέχειν, xi. 53
ἐνθάδε, xxiv. 41
ἔνθεν, xvi. 26
*ἐνισχύω, [xxii. 43]
**ἐνκάθετος, xx. 20
ἐνκακεῖν, xviii. 1
**ἔνκυος, ii. 5
**ἐννεύω, i. 62
ἐνοχλέω, vi. 18
ἐντεῦθεν, iv. 9, xiii. 31
ἔντιμος, vii. 2, xiv. 8
ἔντος, xvii. 21
ἐντυλίσσω, xxiii. 53
ἐνώπιον, i. 15 *et passim*
ἐξάγω, xxiv. 50
**ἐξαιτέομαι, xxii. 31
ἐξαίφνης, ii. 13, ix. 39
ἐξαποστέλλω, i. 53, xx. 10, 11, xxiv. 49
**ἐξαστράπτω, ix. 29
ἐξηγέομαι, xxiv. 35
*ἑξῆς, vii. 11, ix. 37
ἔξοδος, ix. 31
ἐξομολογέω, x. 21, xxii. 6
ἐξουθενέω, xviii. 9, xxiii. 11
ἐξουσιάζω, xxii. 25
ἐπαγγελία, xxiv. 49
**ἐπαθροίζομαι, xi. 29
ἐπαινέω, xvi. 8
ἐπαίρω, vi. 20, xi. 27, xvi. 23, xviii. 13, xxi. 28, xxiv. 50
**ἐπαιτέω, xvi. 3, xviii. 35
ἐπάν, xi. 22, 34
ἐπανάγω, v. 3 f.
ἐπαναπαύομαι, x. 6
ἐπανέρχομαι, x. 35, xix. 15
ἐπεί, i. 34, vii. 1 (W.H. mg.)
ἐπειδή, vii. 1, xi. 6
**ἐπειδήπερ, i. 1
*ἐπεῖδον, i. 25
**ἐπεισέρχομαι, xxi. 35
ἔπειτα, xvi. 7
ἐπέρχομαι, i. 35, xi. 22, xxi. 26
ἐπέχω, xiv. 7
ἐπηρεάζω, vi. 28
*ἐπιβιβάζω, x. 34, xix. 35
ἐπιβλέπω, i. 48, ix. 38
ἐπιθυμία, xxii. 15
ἐπικεῖμαι, v. 1, xxiii. 23
**ἐπικρίνω, xxiii. 24
ἐπιλαμβάνομαι, ix. 47, xiv. 4, xx. 20, 26, xxiii. 26
**ἐπιλείχω, xvi. 21
ἐπιμελέομαι, x. 34 f.
**ἐπιμελῶς, xv. 8
ἐπιούσιος, xi. 3
ἐπιπίπτω, i. 12, xv. 20
**ἐπιπορεύομαι, viii. 4
ἐπιρίπτω, xix. 35
**ἐπισιτισμός, ix. 12
ἐπισκέπτομαι, i. 68, 78, vii. 16
ἐπισκιάζω, i. 35, ix. 34
ἐπισκοπή, ix. 44
**ἐπιστάτης, v. 5, viii. 24, 45, ix. 33, 49, xvii. 13
ἐπιστρέφω, i. 16, 17, ii. 39, viii. 55, xvii. 4, 31, xxii. 32
ἐπισυνάγω, xii. 1, xiii. 34, xvii. 37
**ἐπισχύω, xxiii. 5
**[ἐπιτροπεύω, iii. 1]
ἐπίτροπος, viii. 3
ἐπιφαίνω, i. 79
*ἐπιφωνέω, xxiii. 21
ἐπιφώσκω, xxiii. 54
*ἐπιχειρέω, i. 1
**ἐπιχέω, x. 34
ἐργασία, xii. 58
ἔρημος, i. 80, iii. 2 f., iv. 1, 42, v. 16, vii. 24, viii. 29, ix. 12, xv. 4
ἐρημόω, xi. 17
ἐρήμωσις, xxi. 20
ἔριφος, xv. 29
ἐσθής, xxiii. 11, xxiv. 4
*ἑσπέρα, xxiv. 29
εὐαγγελίζομαι, i. 19, ii. 10, iii. 18, iv. 18, 43, vii. 22, viii. 1, ix. 6, xvi. 16, xx. 1
εὖγε, xix. 17

εὐγενής, xix. 12
εὐδοκέω, iii. 22, xii. 32
εὐδοκία, ii. 14, x. 21
**εὐεργέτης, xxii. 25
εὔθετος, ix. 62, xiv. 35
εὐθέως, v. 13, xii. 36, 54, xiv. 5, xvii. 7, xxi. 9
*εὐλαβής, ii. 25
εὐλογητός, i. 68
*εὐτόνως, xxiii. 10
εὐφορέω, xii. 16
εὐφραίνω, xii. 19, xv. 23 f., xvi. 19
εὐχαριστέω, xvii. 16, xviii. 11, xxii. 17, 19
ἐφημερία, i. 5, 8
ἐφίστημι, ii. 9, 38, iv. 39, x. 40, xx. 1, xxi. 34, xxiv. 4
ἔχθρα, xxiii. 12
ἔχιδνα, iii. 7

Ζακχαῖος, xix. 2 f.
Ζαχαρίας (father of John Baptist), i. 5 f., iii. 2
Ζαχαρίας, xi. 51
Ζεβεδαῖος, v. 10
**ζεῦγος, ii. 24, xiv. 19
ζηλωτής, vi. 15
ζημιόω, ix. 25
ζύμη, xii. 1, xiii. 21
ζυμόω, xiii. 21
ζωγρέω, v. 10
ζωή, xii. 15, xvi. 25; ζωὴ αἰώνιος, x. 25, xviii. 18, 30
ζωογονέω, xvii. 33

ἤ, ἀλλ' ἤ, xii. 51
**ἡγεμονεύω, ii. 2, iii. 1
**ἡγεμονία, iii. 1
ἡγεμών, xx. 20, xxi. 12
ἡγέομαι, xxii. 26
ἡδονή, viii. 14
ἡδύοσμον, xi. 42
Ἠλείας, i. 17, iv. 25 f., ix. 8, 19, 30 f., 54
ἡλικία, ii. 52, xii. 25, xix. 3
ἡμέτερος, xvi. 12
**ἡμιθανής, x. 30
ἥμισυς, xix. 8
Ἡρῴδης, i. 5
Ἡρῴδης (Antipas), iii. 1, 19, viii. 3, ix. 7 f., xiii. 31, xxiii. 7 f.
Ἡρῳδιάς, iii. 19
Ἠσαίας, iii. 4, iv. 17
ἡσυχάζω, xiv. 3, xxiii. 56
ἦχος, iv. 37, xxi. 25

*θάμβος, iv. 36, v. 9
θεάομαι, v. 27, vii. 24, xxiii. 55
θεῖον, xvii. 29
θέλημα, xii. 47, xxii. 42, xxiii. 25
θεμέλιος, vi. 48 f., xiv. 29
Θεόφιλος, i. 3
θεραπεία, ix. 11, xii. 42
θεωρέω, x. 18, xiv. 29, xxi. 6, xxiii. 35, 48, xxiv. 37, 39
θεωρία, xxiii. 48
θηλάζω, xi. 27, xxi. 23
**θηρεύω, xi. 54
**θορυβάζω, x. 41
**θραύω, iv. 18 (Is. lviii. 6)
θρηνέω, vii. 32, xxiii. 27
θρίξ, vii. 38 f., xii. 7, xxi. 18
**θρόμβος [xxii. 44]
θρόνος, i. 32, 52, xxii. 30
θυμίαμα, i. 10, 11
θυμιάω, i. 9
θυμός, iv. 28
θύρα, xi. 7, xiii. 24 f.
θυσία, ii. 24, xiii. 1
θυσιαστήριον, i. 11, xi. 51
θύω, xv. 23 f., xxii. 7
Θωμᾶς, vi. 15

Ἰάειρος, viii. 41
Ἰακώβ, i. 33, iii. 34, xiii. 28, xx. 37
Ἰάκωβος (τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου), v. 10, vi. 14, viii. 51, ix. 28, 54
Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου, vi. 15
*ἴασις, xiii. 32
ἴατρος, iv. 23, v. 31
ἴδιος, vi. 41, 44, x. 34, xviii. 28; κατ' ἰδίαν, ix. 10, x. 23
ἰδού, i. 20 *et passim*
**ἵδρως, [xxii. 44]
ἱερατεία, i. 9
**ἱερατεύω, i. 8
Ἰερειχώ, x. 30, xviii. 35, xix. 1
ἱερεύς, i. 5, v. 14, vi. 4, x. 31, xvii. 14, xx. 1
ἱερόν, ii. 27, 37, 46, iv. 9, xviii. 10, xix. 45, 47, xx. 1, xxi. 5, 37 f., xxii. 52, 53, xxiv. 53
Ἱεροσόλυμα, ii. 22, xiii. 22, xix. 28, xxiii. 7
Ἱερουσαλήμ, ii. 25 *et passim*
ἱκανός, iii. 16, vii. 6, 12, viii. 27, 32, xx. 9, xxii. 38, xxiii. 8, 9
**ἴκμας, viii. 6
ἱλάσκομαι, xviii. 13
ἱμάς, iii. 16
ἱματισμός, vii. 25, ix. 29
Ἰορδάνης, iii. 3, iv. 1
Ἰουδαία, i. 5, 65, ii. 4, iii. 1, iv. 44, v. 17, vi. 17, vii. 17, xxi. 21, xxiii. 5
Ἰούδας, i. 39, iii. 33
Ἰούδας (Iscariot), vi. 16, xxii. 3, 47, 48
Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, vi. 16
Ἰσαάκ, iii. 34, xiii. 28, xx. 37
**ἰσάγγελος, xx. 36
Ἰσκαριώθ, vi. 16; Ἰσκαριώτης, xxii. 3
ἴσος, vi. 34

ἰσχυρός, iii. 16, xi. 21 f., xv. 14
**ἴσως, xx. 13
Ἰτουραία, iii. 1
Ἰωάνα, viii. 3
Ἰωάνης (Baptist), i. 13, 60, 63, iii. 2 f., v. 33, vii. 18 f., ix. 7 f., 19, xi. 1, xvi. 16, xx. 4 f.
Ἰωάνης (τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου), v. 10, vi. 14, viii. 51, ix. 28, 49, 54, xxii. 8
Ἰωνᾶς, xi. 29 f.
Ἰωσήφ, i. 27, ii. 4, 16, iii. 23, iv. 22
Ἰωσήφ (of Arimathea), xxiii. 50

*καθεξῆς, i. 3, viii. 1
*καθίημι, v. 19
**καθοπλίζομαι, xi. 21
*καθότι, i. 7, xix. 9
καθώς, i. 2 *et passim*
Καιάφας, iii. 2
Καῖσαρ, ii. 1, iii. 1, xx. 22 f., xxiii. 2
κακοποιεῖν, vi. 9
κακοῦργος, xxiii. 32 f.
κακῶς ἐχεῖν, v. 31, vii. 2
καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, viii. 15
καλῶς, vi. 26, 27, xx. 39
κάμηλος, xviii. 25
καρπός, i. 42, vi. 44, xii. 17, xiii. 6 f., xx. 10; καρπὸν ποιεῖν, iii. 8 f., vi. 43, viii. 8, xiii. 9
καρποφορέω, viii. 15
κάρφος, vi. 41 f.
**κατάβασις, xix. 37
καταβολὴ κόσμου, xi. 50
κατάγω, v. 11
**καταδέω, x. 34
καταδικάζω, vi. 37
καταισχύνω, xiii. 17
*κατακλείω, iii. 20
**κατακλίνω, vii. 36, ix. 14 f., xiv. 8, xxiv. 30
κατακλυσμός, xvii. 27
*κατακολουθέω, xxiii. 55
**κατακρημνίζω, iv. 29
**καταλιθάζω, xx. 6
κατάλυμα, ii. 7, xxii. 11
καταλύω, xxi. 6; meaning 'to find lodging,' ix. 12, xix. 7 (peculiar to Lk.)
**κατανεύω, v. 7
κατανοέω, vi. 41, xii. 24, 27, xx. 23
καταξιόω, xx. 35
καταπατέω, viii. 5, xii. 1
καταπέτασμα, xxiii. 45
*καταπίπτω, viii. 6
**καταπλέω, viii. 26
καταργέω, xiii. 7
καταρτίζω, vi. 40
κατασκευάζω, i. 17, vii. 27
κατασκηνόω, xiii. 19
κατασκήνωσις, ix. 58
**κατασύρω, xii. 58
**κατασφάζω, xix. 27
καταφιλέω, vii. 38, 45, xv. 20
**καταψύχω, xvi. 24
κατέναντι, xix. 30
κατέρχομαι, iv. 31, ix. 37
κατευθύνω, i. 79
κατέχω, iv. 42, viii. 15, xiv. 9
κατηχέω, i. 4
κατισχύω, xxi. 36, xxiii. 23
καύσων, xii. 55
Καφαρναούμ, iv. 23, 31, vii. 1, x. 15
κελεύω, xviii. 40
κενός, i. 53, xx. 10, 11
**κέραμος, v. 19
κέρας, i. 69
**κεράτιον, xv. 16
κῆπος, xiii. 19
**κήριον [xxiv. 42]
κινδυνεύω, viii. 23
*κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, xxiv. 35
κλάω, xxii. 19, xxiv. 30
κλεῖς τῆς γνώσεως, xi. 52
Κλεόπας, xxiv. 18
κλίνη, v. 18, viii. 16, xvii. 34
**κλινίδιον, v. 19, 24
κλίνω, ix. 12, 58, xxiv. 5, 29
**κλισία, ix. 14
κλύδων, viii. 24
κοίτη, xi. 7
κολλάομαι, x. 11, xv. 15
κόλπος, vi. 38, xvi. 22, 23
**κοπρία, xiv. 35
**κόπριον, xiii. 8
**κόραξ, xii. 24
**κόρος, xvi. 7
**κραιπάλη, xxi. 34
Κρανίον, xxiii. 33
κραταιόομαι, i. 80, ii. 40
*κράτιστος, i. 3
κράτος, ποιεῖν, i. 51
κρεμάννυμι, xxiii. 39
κρίνον, xii. 27
κρίσις, x. 14, xi. 31 f., 42
κρούω, xi. 9 f., xii. 36, xiii. 25
**κρύπτη, xi. 33
κτάομαι, xviii. 12, xxi. 19
κτῆνος, x. 34
κυκλόω, xxi. 20
Κυρηναῖος, xxiii. 26
Κυρήνιος, ii. 2
κυριεύω, xxii. 25
κύων, xvi. 21

λαγχάνω, i. 9
Λάζαρος, xvi. 20 f.
λαμπρός, xxiii. 11
**λαμπρῶς, xvi. 19
**λαξευτός, xxiii. 53
**λεῖος, iii. 5
λείπω, xviii. 22
λειτουργία, i. 23

λέπρα, v. 12, 13
λεπρός, iv. 27, vii. 22, xvii. 12
λεπτόν, xii. 59, xxi. 2
Λευεί, v. 27 f.
Λευείτης, x. 32
**λῆρος, xxiv. 11
**λικμάω, xx. 18
λίμνη, v. 1 f., viii. 22 f.
λιμός, iv. 25, xv. 14, 17, xxi. 11
*λοιμός, xxi. 11 (used fig. in Ac. xxiv. 5)
λύπη, xxii. 45
Λυσανίας, iii. 1
**λυσιτελέω, xvii. 2
λυτρόομαι, xxiv. 21
λύτρωσις, i. 68, ii. 38
λυχνία, viii. 16, xi. 33
λύχνος, viii. 16, xi. 33, 34, 36, xii. 35, xv. 8
Λώτ, xvii. 28 f.

Μαγδαληνή, viii. 2, xxiv. 10
Μαθθαῖος, vi. 15
μακαρίζω, i. 48
μακάριος, i. 45, vi. 20 f., vii. 23, x. 23, xi. 27, 28, xii. 37 f., xiv. 14, 15, xxiii. 29
μακροθυμέω, xviii. 7
μαλακός, vii. 25
μαμωνᾶς, xvi. 9, 11, 13
Μάρθα, x. 38 f.
Μαρία (Magdalene), viii. 2, xxiv. 10
Μαριάμ (Mother of Jesus Christ), i. 27 f., ii. 5 f.
Μαριάμ (sister of Martha), x. 39, 42
μαρτυρέω, iv. 22
μαρτυρία, xxii. 71
μαρτύριον, v. 14, ix. 5, xxi. 13
μάρτυς, xi. 48, xxiv. 48
μάστιξ, vii. 21
μαστός, xi. 27, xxiii. 29
μεγαλειότης, ix. 43
μεγαλύνω, i. 46, 58
μέθη, xxi. 34
μεθίστημι, xvi. 4
μεθύσκομαι, xii. 45
**μελίσσιος, [xxiv. 42]
**μενοῦν, xi. 28
μερίς, x. 42
**μεριστής, xii. 14
μεταδίδωμι, iii. 11
μετανοέω, x. 13, xi. 32, xiii. 3 f., xv. 7 f., xvi. 30, xvii. 3 f.
μετάνοια, iii. 3, 8, v. 32, xv. 7, xxiv. 47
**μετεωρίζομαι, xii. 29
μέτοχος, v. 7
μηνύω, xx. 37
**μίσθιος, xv. 17, 19
μισθός, vi. 23, 35, x. 7
**μνᾶ, xix. 13 f.
μνηστεύομαι, i. 27, ii. 5
μόδιος, xi. 33
μοιχεύω, xvi. 18, xviii. 20
μοιχός, xviii. 11
μόλις, ix. 39
μονογενής, vii. 12, viii. 42, ix. 38
μόσχος, xv. 23 f.
**μυλικός, xvii. 2
μυριάς, xii. 1
μύρον, vii. 37 f., xxiii. 56
μυστήριον, viii. 10
μωραίνω, xiv. 34
Μωυσῆς, ii. 22, v. 14, ix. 30 f., xvi. 29 f., xx. 28, 37, xxiv. 27, 44

Ναζαρά, iv. 16
Ναζαρέτ, i. 26, ii. 4, 39, 51
Ναζαρηνός, iv. 34, xxiv. 19
Ναζωραῖος, xviii. 37
Ναιμάν, iv. 27
Ναίν, vii. 11
ναός, i. 9, 21 f.
νήθω, xii. 27
νηστεία, ii. 37
νηστεύω, v. 33 f., xviii. 12
νικάω, xi. 22
Νινευείτης, xi. 30 f.
νομικός, vii. 30, x. 25, xi. 45 f., xiv. 3
νομοδιδάσκαλος, v. 17
**νοσσιά, xiii. 34
**νοσσός, ii. 24 (Lev. xii. 8)
νότος, xi. 31, xii. 55, xiii. 29
νοῦς, xxiv. 45
Νῶε, xvii. 26 f.

ξηραίνω, viii. 6
ξηρός, vi. 6 f., xxiii. 31
ξύλον, xxii. 52

ὅδε, x. 39
**ὁδεύω, x. 33
*ὀδυνάομαι, ii. 48, xvi. 24 f.
οἰκέτης, xvi. 13
οἰκοδεσπότης, xii. 39, xiii. 25, xiv. 21, xxii. 11
**οἰκονομέω, xvi. 2
οἰκονομία, xvi. 2 f.
οἰκονόμος, xii. 42, xvi. 1 f.
οἰκουμένη, ii. 1, iv. 5, xxi. 26
οἰκτίρμων, vi. 36
οἰνοπότης, vii. 34
**ὄμβρος, xii. 54
*ὁμιλέω, xxiv. 14 f.
ὁμολογεῖν ἐν, xii. 8
**ὄνειδος, i. 25
ὄντως, xxiii. 47, xxiv. 34
ὀπτασία, i. 22, xxiv. 23
**ὀπτός, xxiv. 42
ὀργή, iii. 7, xxi. 23
**ὀρεινός, i. 39, 65
**ὀρθρίζω, xxi. 38

**ὀρθρινός, xxiv. 22
ὄρθρος, xxiv. 1
ὀρθῶς, vii. 43, x. 28, xx. 21
ὁρίζω, xxii. 22
ὁσιότης, i. 75
ὀστέον, xxiv. 39
ὀσφύς, xii. 35
**οὐσία, xv. 12 f.
ὀφειλέτης, xiii. 4
ὀφείλω, vii. 41, xi. 4, xvi. 5 f., xvii. 10
ὄφις, x. 19, xi. 11
**ὀφρύς, iv. 29
ὀψώνιον, iii. 14

παγίς, xxi. 35
παιδεύω, xxiii. 16, 22
παιδισκή, xii. 45, xxii. 56
παίω, xxii. 64
παλαιόω, xii. 33
**πανδοχεῖον, x. 34
**πανδοχεύς, x. 35
πανοπλία, xi. 22
**πανουργία, xx. 23
**παμπληθεί, xiii. 18
παντελής, xiii. 11
πάντως, iv. 23
*παραβιάζομαι, xxiv. 29
παραβολή, iv. 23, v. 36, vi. 39, viii. 4 f., xii. 16, 41, xiii. 6, xiv. 7, xv. 3, xviii. 1, 9, xix. 11, xx. 9, 19, xxi. 29
παράδεισος, xxiii. 43
**παράδοξος, v. 26
παραιτέομαι, xiv. 18 f.
**παρακαθέζομαι, x. 39
**παρακαλύπτομαι, ix. 45
παράκλησις, ii. 25, vi. 24
παρακολουθέω, i. 3
**παράλιος, vi. 17
παραλύομαι, v. 18, 24
παρασκευή, xxiii. 54
παρατηρέω, vi. 7, xiv. 1, xx. 20
**παρατήρησις, xvii. 20
παραχρῆμα, i. 64, iv. 39, v. 25, viii. 44, 47, 55, xiii. 13, xviii. 43, xix. 11, xxii. 60
πάρειμι, xiii. 1
παρεμβάλλω, xix. 43
**παρθενία, ii. 36
παρθένος, i. 27
παρίημι, xi. 42
παροικέω, xxiv. 18
πάσχα, ii. 41, xxii. 1 f.
πατέω, x. 19, xxi. 24
πατριά, ii. 4
παύομαι, v. 4, viii. 24, xi. 1
**πεδινός, vi. 17
Πειλᾶτος, iii. 1, xiii. 1, xxiii. 1 f.
πειρασμός, iv. 14, viii. 13, xi. 4, xxii. 28, 40, 46
πενθερά, iv. 38, xii. 53
**πενιχρός, xxi. 2
**περιάπτω, xxii. 55
περιέχω, v. 9
περιζώννυμαι, xii. 35, 37, xvii. 8
**περικρύπτω, i. 24
**περικυκλόω, xix. 43
*περιλάμπω, ii. 9
**περιοικέω, i. 65
**περίοικος, i. 58
περιπίπτειν, x. 30
περιποιέομαι, xvii. 33
**περισπάομαι, x. 40
περιστερά, ii. 24, iii. 22
περιτέμνω, i. 59, ii. 21
Πέτρος, v. 8, vi. 14, viii. 45, 51, ix. 20, 28 f., xii. 41, xviii. 28, xxii. 8, 34, 54 f., [xxiv. 12]
**πήγανον, xi. 42
πήρα, ix. 3, x. 4, xxii. 35 f.
πῆχυς, xii. 25
**πιέζω, vi. 38
πίμπλημι, i. 15 *et passim*
**πινακίδιον, i. 63
πίναξ, xi. 39
πιστεύω, i. 20, 45, viii. 12, 13, 50, xvi. 11, xx. 5, xxii. 67, xxiv. 25
πίστις, v. 20, vii. 9, 50, viii. 25, 48, xvii. 5, 6, 19, xviii. 8, 42, xxii. 32
πιστός, xii. 42, xvi. 10 f., xix. 17
πλεονεξία, xii. 15
πλέω, viii. 23
πληγή, x. 30, xii. 48
**πλημμύρα, vi. 48
πλήν, vi. 24 *et passim*
πλήρης, iv. 1, v. 12
πληροφορέω, i. 1
πλουτέω, i. 53
πλύνω, v. 2
πνεῦμα, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, i. 15 *et passim*
ποιμαίνω, xvii. 7
ποιμήν, ii. 8 f.
ποίμνη, ii. 8
ποίμνιον, xii. 32
πολίτης, xv. 15, xix. 14
πορεία, xiii. 22
πόρνη, xv. 30
πόρρω, xiv. 32, xxiv. 28
πόρρωθεν, xvii. 12
πορφύρα, xvi. 19
**πραγματεύομαι, xix. 13
**πράκτωρ, xii. 58
πράσσω, iii. 13, xix. 23, xxii. 23, xxiii. 15, 41
**πρεσβεία, xiv. 32, xix. 14
πρεσβυτέριον, xxii. 66
πρεσβύτης, i. 18
πρίν, ii. 26, xxii. 61
προβαίνω, i. 7, 18, ii. 36
*προβάλλω, xxi. 30
προδότης, vi. 16

προκόπτω, ii. 52
**προμελετάω, xxi. 14
*προπορεύομαι, i. 76
**προσαναβαίνω, xiv. 10
**προσδαπανάω, x. 35
*προσδοκία, xxi. 26
**προσεργάζομαι, xix. 16
προσευχή, vi. 12, xix. 46, xxii. 45
προσεύχομαι, i. 10, iii. 21 *et passim*
προσέχω, xii. 1, xvii. 3, xx. 46, xxi. 34
**προσποιέομαι, xxiv. 28
**προσρήγνυμι, vi. 48 f.
προστίθημι, iii. 20, xii. 25, 31, xvii. 5, xix. 11, xx. 11, 12
προσψαύω, xi. 46
*προϋπάρχω, xxiii. 12
**προφέρω, vi. 45
πρωτότοκος, ii. 7
πτερύγιον, iv. 9
**πτοέομαι, xxi. 9, xxiv. 37
πτύον, iii. 17
**πτύσσω, iv. 20
πτῶσις, ii. 34
πυκνός, v. 33
πύλη, vii. 12
πυλών, xvi. 20
πυνθάνομαι, xv. 26, xviii. 36
πύργος, xiii. 4, xiv. 28
πυρετός, iv. 38 f.

**ῥῆγμα, vi. 49
ῥῆμα ('word'), i. 38 *et saepe*; ('thing'), i. 37, 65, ii. 15, 19, 51
ῥομφαία, ii. 35
ῥύμη, xiv. 21
ῥύσις, viii. 43 f.

Σαδδουκαῖος, xx. 27
**σάλος, xxi. 25
Σαμαρείτης, ix. 52, x. 33, xvii. 16
Σαμαρία, xvii. 11
Σάρεπτα, iv. 26
σάρξ, iii. 6 (Is. xl. 5), xxiv. 39
σαρόω, xi. 25, xv. 8
Σατανᾶς, x. 18, xi. 18, xiii. 16, xxii. 3, 31
σάτον, xiii. 21
σεισμός, xxi. 11
σημεῖον, ii. 12, 34, xi. 16, 29 f., xxi. 7, 11, 25
σής, xii. 33
σιαγών, vi. 29
σιγάω, ix. 36, xviii. 39, xx. 26
Σιδών, vi. 17, x. 13, 14
Σιδωνία, iv. 26
**σίκερα, i. 15
Σιλωάμ, xiii. 4
Σίμων (Πέτρος), iv. 38, v. 3 f., vi. 14, xxii. 31, xxiv. 34
Σίμων (Ζηλώτης), vi. 15
Σίμων, vii. 40 f.
σινδών, xxiii. 53
**σινιάζω, xxii. 31
**σιτευτός, xv. 23 f.
**σιτομέτριον, xii. 42
σκανδαλίζω, vii. 23, xvii. 2
σκάνδαλον, xvii. 1
**σκάπτω, vi. 48, xiii. 8, xvi. 3
σκηνή, ix. 33, xvi. 9
**σκιρτάω, i. 41, 44, vi. 23
σκοπέω, xi. 35
σκορπίος, x. 19, xi. 12
σκύλλω, vii. 6, viii. 49
**σκῦλον, xi. 22
Σολομών, xi. 31, xii. 27
**σορός, vii. 14
σουδάριον, xix. 20
Σουσάννα, viii. 3
σοφία, ii. 40, 52, vii. 35, xi. 31, 49, xxi. 15
**σπαργανόω, ii. 7, 12
σπλαγχνίζομαι, vii. 13, x. 33, xv. 20
σπλάγχνον, i. 78
στάσις, xxiii. 19, 25
σταυρός, ix. 23, xiv. 27, xxiii. 26
σταυρόω, xxiii. 21, 23, xxiv. 7, 20
στεῖρος, i. 7, 36, xxiii. 29
στῆθος, xviii. 13, xxiii. 48
στηρίζω, ix. 51, xvi. 26, xxii. 32
**στιγμή, iv. 5
στράτευμα, xxiii. 11
στρατεύομαι, iii. 14
*στρατηγός, xxii. 4, 52
*στρατία, ii. 13
στρατιώτης, vii. 8, xxiii. 36
**στρατόπεδον, xxi. 20
στρούθιον, xii. 6 f.
*συγγένεια, i. 61
συγγενής, i. 58, ii. 44, xiv. 12, xxi. 16
**συγγενίς, i. 36
**συγκυρία, x. 31
**συκάμινος, xvii. 6
συκῆ, xiii. 6 f., xxi. 29
**συκομορέα, xix. 4
σῦκον, vi. 44
**συκοφαντέω, iii. 14, xix. 8
συλλαμβάνω, v. 5, xxii. 54; ('to conceive') i. 24, 31, 36, ii. 21; συλλαμβάνεσθαι, v. 7
**συλλογίζομαι, xx. 5
Συμεών, ii. 25, 34
συμφωνέω, v. 36
**συμφωνία, xv. 25
συνακολουθέω, xxiii. 49
συνανάκειμαι, vii. 49, xiv. 10, 15
συναντάω, ix. 37, xxii. 10
συναντιλαμβάνομαι, x. 40
*συναρπάζω, viii. 29
*συνβάλλω, ii. 19, xiv. 31
συνέδριον, xxii. 66

**σύνειμι (ibo), viii. 4
*σύνειμι (sum), ix. 18
συνεσθίω, xv. 2
συνευδοκέω, xi. 48
συνέχω, iv. 38, viii. 37, 45, xii. 50, xix. 43, xxii. 63
**συνθλάομαι, xx. 18
συνίστημι, ix. 32
συνκαθίζω, xxii. 55
συνκαλέω, ix. 1, xv. 6, 9, xxiii. 13
**συνκαλύπτω, xii. 2
**συνκατατίθεμαι, xxiii. 51
συνκλείω, v. 6
συνκύπτω, xiii. 11
συνλαλέω, iv. 36, ix. 30, xxii. 4
**συνοδία, ii. 44
συνοχή, xxi. 25
**συνπαραγίνομαι, xxiii. 48
**συνπίπτω, vi. 49
*συνπληρόω, viii. 23, ix. 51
συντελέω, iv. 2, 13
συντηρέω, ii. 19
συντίθεμαι, xxii. 5
**συντυγχάνω, viii. 19
**συνφύομαι, viii. 7
συνχαίρω, i. 58, xv. 6, 9
Συρία, ii. 2
Σύρος, iv. 27
σωματικός, iii. 22
σωτήρ, i. 47, ii. 11
σωτηρία, i. 69, 71, 77, xix. 9
σωτήριον, ii. 30, iii. 6

τάξις, i. 8
ταπείνωσις, i. 48
τελειόω, ii. 43, xiii. 32
τελείωσις, i. 45
**τελεσφορέω, viii. 14
τελέω, ii. 39, xii. 50, xviii. 31, xxii. 37
τέλος, i. 33, xviii. 5, xxi. 9, xxii. 37
**τετρααρχέω, iii. 1
τετραάρχης, iii. 19, ix. 7
**τετραπλοῦς, xix. 8
Τιβέριος, iii. 1
*τίθημι, τίθεμαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, i. 66, xxi. 14 ; εἰς τὰ ὦτα, ix. 44
τοίνυν, xx. 25
τόκος, xix. 23
**τραῦμα, x. 34
*τραυματίζω, xx. 12
*τραχύς, iii. 5 (Is. xl. 4)
Τραχωνῖτις, iii. 1
τρῆμα, xviii. 25
τρυγάω, vi. 44
**τρυγών, ii. 24 (Lev. xii. 8)
τρυφή, vii. 25
τυγχάνω, xx. 35
Τύρος, vi. 17, x. 13, 14

ὑβρίζω, xi. 45, xviii. 32
ὑγιαίνω, v. 31, vii. 10, xv. 27
**ὑγρός, xxiii. 31
ὑδρωπικός, xiv. 2
ὑπάρχω, vii. 25 *et saepe*
**ὑπερεκχύννομαι, vi. 38
ὑπερήφανος, i. 51
ὑπηρέτης, i. 2, iv. 20
ὕπνος, ix. 32
ὑποδείκνυμι, iii. 7, vi. 47, xii. 5
ὑποδέχομαι, x. 38, xix. 6
ὑπόδημα, iii. 16, x. 4, xv. 22, xxii. 35
**ὑποκρίνομαι, xx. 20
ὑπολαμβάνω, vii. 43, x. 30
ὑπομιμνήσκω, xxii. 61
ὑπομονή, viii. 15, xxi. 19
ὑποστρέφω, i. 56 *et saepe*
**ὑποστρωννύω, xix. 36
ὑποτάσσω, ii. 51, x. 17, 20
**ὑποχωρέω, v. 16, ix. 10
ὑπωπιάζω, xviii. 5
ὑστερέω, xv. 14, xxii. 35
ὑστέρημα, xxi. 4
ὑψηλός, xvi. 15
ὕψιστος, i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35, viii. 28 ; ἐν ὑψίστοις, ii. 14, xix. 38
ὕψος, i. 78, xxiv. 49
ὑψόω, i. 52, x. 15, xiv. 11, xviii. 14

**φάραγξ, iii. 5 (Is. xl. 4)
**φάτνη, ii. 7 f., xiii. 15
φήμη, iv. 14
φθάνω, xi. 20
**φιλάργυρος, xvi. 14
φιλέω, xx. 46, xxii. 47
φίλημα, vii. 45, xxii. 48
Φίλιππος (Herod), iii. 1
Φίλιππος, vi. 14
**φιλονεικία, xxii. 24
φίλος, vii. 6, 34, xi. 5 f., xii. 4, xiv. 10, 12, xv. 6, 9, 29, xvi. 9, xxi. 16, xxiii. 12
φιμόω, iv. 35
φλόξ, xvi. 24
**φόβηθρον, xxi. 11
φόρος, xx. 22, xxiii. 2
φορτίζω, xi. 46
φορτίον, xi. 46
φραγμός, xiv. 23
φρέαρ, xiv. 5
φρόνησις, i. 17
φρόνιμος, xii. 42, xvi. 8
**φρονίμως, xvi. 8
φυλή, ii. 36, xxii. 30
φυτεύω, xiii. 6, xvii. 6, 28, xx. 9
φύω, viii. 6, 8
φωλεός, ix. 58

**χάραξ, xix. 43
χαρίζομαι, vii. 21, 42 f.
χάριν, vii. 47

**χάρις**, i. 30, ii. 40, 52, iv. 22, vi. 32 f., xvii. 9
**χαριτόω**, i. 28
****χάσμα**, xvi. 26
**χιλιάς**, xiv. 31
**χιτών**, iii. 11, vi. 29, ix. 3
**Χοραζείν**, x. 13
****χορός**, xv. 25
**Χουζᾶς**, viii. 3
****χράω**, xi. 5
****χρεοφειλέτης**, vii. 41, xvi. 5
**χρηματίζω**, ii. 26
**χρίω**, iv. 18 (Is. lxi. 1)

**ψαλμός**, xx. 42, xxiv. 44
**ψηλαφάω**, xxiv. 39
**ψηφίζω**, xxiv. 28
****ψώχω**, vi. 1

****ᾦον**, xi. 12
**ὠτίον**, xxii. 51

# INDEX OF WRITERS AND WRITINGS

Abbott, E. A., xlvi n., 153
Abbott, T. K., lxxxvi
Abrahams, lxxxviii, 57, 81, 100, 151, 155, 208, 226, 275, 279, 312 n.
Adamantius, xxix
Agrippa Castor, xxvii
*Ahikar, Story of*, 181
Albertus Magnus, xxxix
Albertz, lxxxviii, 76, 245
Alciphron, 54, 75
Ambrose, xxx n., xxxv f., xxxix, xl, 197
'Ambrosiaster,' xxxii n.
Annius of Viterbo, 59
Anselm of Laon, xxxix
Antiphon, 5, 53
*Apostolic Constitutions*, 40
Aretaeus, xx
*Aristeas, Letter of*, 1, 3
Aristophanes, 69, 191, 203, 256
pseudo-Aristotle, 51, 164
Arnobius, xxxvi f.
Arrian, 3
Athanasius, xxxiii, xxxvii
Athenaeus, 200
Augustine, xxxvi, xl, xlv, 192

*Baba Qamma*, 189, 199
Bardenhewer, xxxiv f., 19
*Barnabas, Epistle of*, 58
Basil, xxxvii
Basilides, xxvii f.
Bate, H. N., 264
Bauer, D. W., lxxxviii, lxxxix
Baur, F. C., xlvi f., xlviii, 103
Bede, xxxix
Beerman, lxxxvi
Belsheim, lxxxvi
Bengel, xliv, 223, 224
*Berachoth*, 57, 157
*Bereshith Rabba*, 68
Bernays, J., 94, 235
Beza, xlii, 180
Billerbeck. *See* Strack
Blass, xxii, lxxxvii, 2, 25, 32, 40, 52, 57, 86, 101, 138, 153, 181, 264, 265
Bousset, lxxxviii, 6, 12, 62, 213, 267
Brandt, 313
Brooke, A. E., 265
Bruder, xlviii
Brun, Lyder, 314
Bruno Astensis, xxxix n.
Bultmann, vii, lv, lxxxviii, 38, 47, 68, 81, 120 f., 142, 161, 203, 218, 244, 278, 313
Burkitt, F. C., viii, xvi n., xxiii, lxxxvi, lxxxviii, 57, 100, 140 n., 156, 238, 261, 279, 292, 313, 317 f.
Burton, E. D., 5

Cadbury, xiii, xix f., xxi n., lxxxiii, lxxxviii, 1, 3, 4, 5, 34
Caesar, C. Julius, 235
Cajetan, 18
Calvin, 42
*Chagiga*, 57, 210, 213
Charles, R. H., lxxxviii
Charpentier, 38
Chase, F. H., 156
Christ, W., 51
Christianus Druthmarus, xxxix
Chrysostom, xxxvii, 10, 16, 168
Cicero, 295
Clemen, 31
Clement of Alexandria, xxvii, 197, 230
Clement of Rome, xxii, 5, 96, 137, 214
pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homilies*, 62, 98, 311 n., *Recognitions*, 15, 144
*Codex Theodosianus*, 88
Colson, F. H., 4, 5
Confucius, 94
*Corpus Inscript. Graec.*, 308, 309
*Corpus Inscript. Lat.*, 308
*Corpus Inscript. Semit.*, 113
Cramer, xxxvii f.
Cumont, 31
pseudo-Cyprian, *De pascha computus*, 211
Cyril of Alexandria, xxxiv f., xxxvi n., xxxvii, xxxviii, xl, xliii, 271

Dalman, lxxxviii, 172
Danby, H., 275
Debrunner, 157
Deissmann, lxxvi, 179, 180, 198, 281
De Lagarde, 6
Demosthenes, 4

*Diatessaron*, xxix
Dibelius, lxxxviii, 54, 136, 206, 280, 313
*Didache*, xxv f., 157, 224, 265
Diodore of Tarsus, xxxiv
Diodorus Siculus, xii n., 1, 3, 180
Diogenes Laertius, 15
*Diognetus, Letter to*, 137
pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, xxxvii
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 2, 194, 223
Dioscurides, 1, 3
*Disputatio Archelai et Manetis*, xxvii
Dittenberger. See *Inscriptiones*
Driver, 9

Easton, lxxxvii
Eckhel, 48
Ehrhard, A., xxxvii n.
Eichorn, xlv
Eitrem, 62
*Enoch, Book of*, 51. 54, 288
Epictetus, 41, 70, 310
Epiphanius, xxix n., 88, 144
*Epistula Apostolorum*, xxx
Erasmus, xl f.
Etheridge, 32
Eucherius of Lerins, xxxvii
Euripides, lxxxi, 49, 68, 173, 279, 297
Eusebius, xxi, xxxiii, 59, 88, 233, 256, 295
Euthymius Zigabenus, xxxviii

Feine, l, lxiv n., lxxxviii, 271
Ferrar, W. F., lxxxvi
Fiebig, 99 f.
Field, 95
Frey, 313
Friedländer, 2 n.

Galen, xx, 71
Garbe, 38
Gardner-Smith, P., 292, 317
Geden, A. S., lxxxviii
Geffcken, 31
Gibbon, 94
Gilbert de la Porrée, xxxix
*Ginza*, 106
*Glossa interlinearis*, xxxix
*Glossa ordinaria*, xxxix
Goguel, M., lxxxviii
Goodwin, 52
Gray, Buchanan, 259
Gregory of Nazianzus, xxi, xxxvii
Gregory of Nyssa, xxxvii, 156, 218
Gregory, C. R., lxxxvi
Gressmann, 6, 10, 11, 17, 24, 30 f., 36, 196, 209 f.
Griesbach, xlv, xlvii
Griffith, F. Ll., 210
Grimm, lxxxviii
Grotius, xliii, 45, 168, 230
Gunkel, 6, 19, 306

Halévy, 151 f.
Hammond, xliii f.
Harnack, xv, xviii, xix, xxii, lxxxix, 7, 13 f., 22, 54, 74, 83, 92 f., 109, 132 f., 148 f., 163, 273, 281, 286, 319
Harris, Rendel, 141, 281
Hatch, E., lxxxviii
Hawkins, Sir J. C., vii, xv, lxii, lxiv, lxxxi, lxxxiii, lxxxix
*Hebrews, Gospel according to*, xlv, xlvi, 56, 157, 168, 233, 299
Hegesippus, 63, 286, 295
Hephaestion, 15
Heracleon, xxviii
Herder, xlv f., li
Hermas, *The Shepherd*, xxvi
*Hermeticum, Corpus*, 148, 150
Herodas, 53
Herodotus, 169, 192
Hesiod, 143, 255
Hilgenfeld, xlviii
Hillel, 94
Hippocrates, xx, 153
Hirschfeld, 2 n.
Hobart, xix f., 153
Holtzmann, H. J., xxiii, xlix, 307, 319
Homer, 10, 299
Horace, 49, 97, 194
Horner, lxxxvi
Hort, lxxxv, 263, 288
Hoskier, lxxxvi
Howard, W. F., lxxxvii
Hunkin, xxiv, 52
Husband, R. W., 275

Ignatius, 57, 80, 137, 220, 299
*Inscriptiones*. See *Corpus*
*Inscriptiones selectae Orientis Graeci*, ed. Dittenberger, 35, 50, 52, 69, 101, 137, 180
Irenaeus, xiii, xxix, xxxii, 3, 22, 150
Isidore of Pelusium, xxxvii
Isocrates, 94

James, M. R., 211
Jerome, xxi, xxix, xxxii f., xli, 22, 152, 157, 200
John of Damascus, 19
*Joma*, 205
Josephus, xxiii f., lxxvii, lxxxi, 1, 2, 3, 10, 24, 28 f., 44, 47, 49, 52, 53, 55, 63, 104, 152, 160, 180, 207, 233, 242, 257, 259, 260, 295, 307 f., 310 f.
Jülicher, lxxxix, 115, 190, 193 f., 202, 232 f.
Julius Africanus, xxi, 59
Justin Martyr, xiii, xxvii, 4, 52, 57 f., 246, 262

Klostermann, vii, lxxxvii, 1, 24, 36, 51, 127, 141, 164, 173, 178, 189, 223, 242, 270 f., 298

Krenkel, xxiii
Krumbacher, xxxvii f., xxxviii

Lachmann, xlvii f.
Lagrange, xxi n., lxxvii f., lxxxi, lxxxvii, 10, 19, 32, 59, 77, 194, 214
Lake, Kirsopp, xvi, xxvi, lxxxvi
Laqueur, 1
Legge, 94
Leisegang, 20
Lessing, xlv, xlvii
Lietzmann, xxxvii n., 264
Loisy, vii, l f., lxxxvii, 11, 17, 42, 66 f., 87, 90, 95, 146, 166 f., 182, 229, 238, 270, 298
Lucian, 53, 63, 213
Luther, xlii

Macalister, R. A. S., 292
*Machilta*, 263
McNeile, A. H., 51, 92, 164, 168
Makarios Chrysokephalos, xxxviii
*Makkoth*, 99
Maldonatus, xlii
Marcion, xxviii f., xlvii, xlviii, li, 141 f., 156, 197, 207, 281
Marsh, Herbert, xlvi n.
Martial, 191
Maspéro, 63
*Matthew, apocryphal Gospel of*, 34
Maximus of Turin, 156
Mead, G. R. S., 313
Merx, 214
Meyer, E., xii n., xviii, lxxxix, 2 n., 47, 55 f., 87, 132 f., 252 f., 261, 275, 313, 314 f.
Michael, J. H., 163
Michaelis, xlvi
Mill, J., 189
Milligan, lxxxviii, lxxxix
Mimnermus, 174
Moffatt, xix, 319
'*Monarchian*' *Prologues*, xxi
Montefiore, vii, lxxxvii, 78, 81, 92, 155, 216
Morin, xxxvii
Moulton, J. H., lxxvi, lxxix, lxxxvii, lxxxviii, 9, 40, 53, 57, 153, 171, 241
Moulton, W. F., lxxxviii

Nathan, Rabbi, 99
Nestlé, 51
Nicander, 84
Nicephorus Callistus, xxi
Nicetas, xxxviii, xl
Nicolas of Damascus, 51
Nock, A. D., viii, 310
Norden, xii n., lxxxix, 1, 4, 7 f., 14 f., 30, 52, 133, 147 f., 255

*Odes of Solomon*, 306
Oecumenius, xxxviii
Origen, xxi, xxxii f., xxxiv, 3, 16, 56, 120, 157, 207, 211, 295
Overbeck, 30
*Oxyrrhyncus Logia*, 68

Papias, xxvi
*Papyri : Pap. Flor.*, 199 ; *Pap. Giessen*, 194 ; *Pap. Lond.*, 33, 104 ; *Pap. Mag. Mus. Lugd. Batav.*, 70 ; *Pap. Oxyrrh.*, 191 ; *Pap. Par.*, 53, 147
*Passion of St. Artemius*, xxi n.
Pausanias, 254
Perles, 195
Perry, 262
*Peter, Gospel of*, xxvi f., 280, 292
*Peter, Teaching of*, 299
*Peter, Vercelli Acts of*, 63
Peter of Riga, 211
Petrus Comestor, xxxix n.
Philo, lxxvii, 10, 15, 20, 44, 57, 164, 235, 286, 313
Philostorgius, xxi
Philostratus, 103
Phrynichus, lxxxiii f., lxxxix, 4, 39, 78, 81, 93, 123, 163, 174, 203, 227, 257
Plato, 86, 169, 213
Plautus, 53
Plummer, xxvi, lxxxvii, 6, 9, 18, 32, 39, 40, 41, 52, 69, 84, 178, 295
Plutarch, 3, 5, 15, 30 f., 44, 97, 142, 199, 235, 269, 285
pseudo-Plutarch, 5
Polybius, 3
Polycarp, 96
Poole, R. L., xxxix
Preisigke, 157
Premerstein, A. von, 29 f.
Preuschen, lxxxviii, lxxxix, 68
*Protevangelium Jacobi*, 8, 17, 18, 39
*Psalms of Solomon*, 35, 36, 306
Ptolemaeus, xxviii

*Qiddushin*, 212

Radermacher, lxxviii, lxxxviii
Ragg, Lonsdale, lxxxvii
Ramsay, W. M., xvi n., lxxxix, 29 f.
Ranke, 247
Rashdall, 92
Rawlinson, A. E. J., viii, liii, lxxxvii, 77 f., 82 f., 115, 140
Redpath, lxxxviii
Reitzenstein, 17, 19, 70, 106, 313
Renan, xlix f., lxxi
Resch, 6
Rider, T. D., xxxix n.
Robinson, J. A., 58
Rohde, 70, 103
Ropes, 5

Routh, 59
Rutherford, W. G., lxxxiii f., lxxxix, 4, 78

*Sabbath*, 189
*Sacred Books of the East.* See *Sutta-Nepâta*
Sanday, xlviii, lxxxviii, lxxxix, 69, 146
Sanders, H. A., lxxxvi
*Sanhedrin*, 208
Schleiermacher, xlvi
Schmid, W., lxxxiii
Schmidt, K. L., vii, liii, lxxxix, 50, 122, 252, 264
Schmiedel, xxiii, 307
Schürer, xxiv, lxxxviii, lxxxix, 8, 28, 32, 52, 66
Schwegler, xlvi
Schweitzer, lxxxix, 241
Scott, E. F., lxxi n.
Seeberg, R., 56
Semler, xliv, xlvii
*Sib. Orac.*, 17, 42
Sickenberger, xxxiv, xxxviii
Simon, R., xxxix, xl
Smith, B. T. D., 80, 115, 207
Smith, J. Ritchie, lxxxii
Smith, R. Payne, xxxiv
Sophocles, xx n., 285
*Sota*, 21
Spitta, l, lxxxix
Stähelin, xli
Stanton, V. H., xxvi, lx n., lxxxix
Strabo, 49, 307
Strack and Billerbeck, lxxxvii, 21, 24, 27, 40, 45, 51, 52, 57, 85, 97, 171, 186 f., 199, 205, 251, 263
Strauss, xlv, xlix
Streeter, vii, xviii, xxvi, xlviii, l, lviii n., lxx, lxxxix, 13 f., 90, 128, 130, 133, 140, 159, 184 f., 262, 278 f., 286, 301
Suidas, 93
*Sutta-Nepâta*, 37
Swete, H. B., viii, 84, 246

*Tamid*, 9, 12
Tatian, xxix
Taylor, V., l, lxxxix, 86 n., 240, 253, 262
Terence, 191
Tertullian, xxxii, 29 f., 156, 197
*Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs*, 5, 27, 152, 310
Thackeray, H. St. J., lxxxvii, 195
Thalassios, xxxviii
Thayer, lxxxviii
Theodore of Mopsuestia, xxxiv
Theodorus Lector, xxi
Theophilus of Antioch, xxix f.
pseudo-Theophilus, xxx, xxxvii
Theophrastus, 2, 153
Theophylact, xxxviii, xli
Thirlwall, Connop, xlvi n.
Thomas Aquinas, xxxix f., 19
Thomsen, 79
Thucydides, 4, 48, 255
Titus of Bostra, xxxiii f.
pseudo-Titus, catena of, xxxvii
Turner, C. H., xvi, xxvi, 58, 71, 292

*Unam Sanctam*, 271
Usener, 14, 56
Ussher, 48

Valentinus, xxvii f.
Verrall, 282
Vincent, 79
Virgil, 16
Volkmar, xlviii
Völter, 7
Volz, 51

Walafrid Strabo, xxxix
Weinreich, 103
Weiss, B., l, lxxxix, 35
Weiss, J., vii, lxxxvii, lxxxix, 7, 12, 24, 25, 27, 35, 42, 82, 86, 104 f., 152, 165, 193 f., 202, 219, 267, 270, 315 f.
Weisse, xlviii
Wellhausen, vii, lxv, lxxviii, lxxxvii, lxxxix, 53, 54, 66 f., 91, 92, 97, 100, 104, 109, 117, 119, 125, 127, 128, 132 f., 138, 163, 165 f., 168 f., 176, 178, 182, 185, 186 f., 196 f., 202 f., 218 f., 222 f., 229 f., 232 f., 239, 247, 252 f., 257, 261 f., 292, 301, 307, 314 f.
Wendland, xxiii n., 1, 35, 173
Wendling, 68
Westcott, xxiii n.
Westermarck, 143
Wettstein, xliv, 94, 172
Wieseler, 48
Wilke, C. G., xlviii
Wilkinson, J. R., lxxxix
Windisch, xiv, xv f., xviii n., 37
Wrede, lii f., lxxxix
Wright, A., lxxxvii

Xenophon, 219

Zahn, xix, lxxxvii, 48, 51, 168, 178, 197, 230, 295, 301

# INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Acts of the Apostles, relation of to Gospel, xi f.
allegorical interpretation, xxix, xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv, xli, xlii f.; rejected by Titus of Bostra, xxxiv, by Cyril of Alexandria, xxxiv f., by Calvin, xlii
Annas, 49, 321
Annunciation, lxxiv, 13 f.
Antipas, Herod, 49, 126 f., 184, 186, 279 f., 311 f.
Apostles, the twelve, 86 f., 177, 269; mission of, 124 f.; reverence for, lxiii, 273
Aramaism, lxxx f., 52, 53, 64, 181, 188, 191
article with indirect question, lxxxii
Augustus, 32, 308; birthday of, 35

Baptism of Jesus, lxxiv, 55 f.
Baptismal rites, 310 f.
*Benedictus*, 25 f., 303 f.
Bethany, 154, 236, 239, 259, 289, 300, 319
Bethlehem, 31 f., 39; cave at, 34
Bethsaida, lxi, 122, 126, 128, 130
Birth of Jesus, lvi f., lxxiv, 6 f., 28 f.
Buddha, stories of the infancy of, 37

Caiaphas, 49
Canon of Scripture, idea of, xxx, xliv f.
Capernaum, 70, 138, 146, 182
census, Roman, 28 f., 32 f.
Christology, lxxxiii f. *See* Messiah, Son of God, Son of Man
circumcision, 24, 38 f.
Cleopas, 295
Council at Jerusalem, xv f.

David, descent from, 16 f., 250 f.
discipleship, conditions of, 193 f.

Egypt, supposed influence of, 15 f., 30 f., 209 f.
Elizabeth, 9 f.; the speaker in the *Magnificat*, 22
Emmaus, 289 f., 294 f., 300
empty tomb, 289 f., 296, 298, 314 f.
Enos-Uthra, 106
eschatology, lxxii f., 47, 132, 175, 220, 232, 297, 318
eucharistic meals, 128, 262, 297, 320
exorcism, 120, 138 f., 160 f.

fishes, narratives of miraculous draught of, 73 f., 320
forgiveness of sins, 79 f., 110, 111, 112, 196 f., 215, 297, 312
four Gospels, harmony of, xxxi, xxxvi
future life, teaching on, 209 f., 249 f., 287 f.

Gadara, 120
Galilee, ministry in, 139, 291, 318
Gehenna, 171
genealogy of Jesus, lvii, 58
Gerasa, 120
Gergesa, 120
*Gloria in excelsis*, 35, 240
Golden Rule, 94

Hannah, song of, 22 f., 306
Hebraism, lxxix f., 9, 10, 18, 21, 25, 36, 54, 114, 134, 137, 141, 153, 195, 203, 233, 245, 265
Horus, birth of, 16

Immanuel, 16
impersonal plural, 71, 82, 173
incarnation of the Logos, 19

Jerusalem, triumphal entry into, 109, 187, 236 f.; journey to, 139 f., 184, 194, 217, 291
John the Baptist, birth of, 6 f., 24 f.; teaching of, 48 f., 104 f., 312 f.; disciples of, 82, 105, 156, 313; baptism of, 46 f., 243 f., 309 f.
Joseph, 13, 19, 42
Jude of James, 88, 321

Kingdom of God, lxxii, 90, 105, 107, 112, 142 f., 146, 161, 169, 178, 184, 188, 190, 194, 206, 218 f., 225, 232, 252, 258, 266, 300

Last Supper, xiii f., 237, 260 f., 297, 302, 320

Law, Mosaic, lxxi, 37, 145, 151, 198 f., 206 f., 248, 300, 311
Lazarus, 110, 154, 319
Luke, relations with Paul, xiii f., xxiii; in ecclesiastical tradition, xxi; supposed acquaintance with *Antiquities* of Josephus, xxiii f., 309
Lysanias, xxiii, 49, 307 f.

*Magnificat*, 22 f., 303 f.
Mandaean literature, 106, 313
Martha, 110, 154, 319
Mary, the mother of Jesus, 18 f., 28 f., 42, 44, 118
Mary Magdalene, 110, 112, 294
Mary, the sister of Martha, 109, 110, 154, 319
*mater dolorosa*, 42
medical language, xix f., 71, 76
Messiah, lxxiii f., 16, 27, 32, 35, 51, 84, 87, 105, 107, 148, 187, 228, 238, 240, 250 f., 275 f.
miracle, Lucan, pagan parallels to a, 102 f.
Mithraism, 31, 310
Mount of Olives, 236, 241, 259, 272

name, given at circumcision, 24, 38
narratives, characteristics of Lucan, lxviii f., lxx, 66, 102, 216, 285
Nazareth, 16, 43, 112; sermon at, xviii, lxvi, 64
*Nunc dimittis*, 39 f.

optative, use of, lxxxi, 21, 25, 53, 115, 267
oral tradition, xlv, li, 4, 128
Osiris, 41
"overshadowing" of the Spirit, 20; of the cloud, 133, 135

papyri, language of, lxxvi f.
parables, Lucan, characteristics of, lxix
Parousia, 132, 175, 220, 232, 297, 318
Passion, lxiii, 109, 277, 296; foretold, 129 f., 137, 225, 301
Passover, 166, 237, 259, 261 f.
Paul, 112, 148, 154, 185, 250, 260 f., 296, 302; picture of in Acts, xvi f.; Paulinism, lxxi f.
Peter, confesses Christ, 129 f.; denies Christ, 275 f., 320; the founder of the Church, 269; sees the risen Lord, 298
Pilate, Pontius, 49, 170, 180, 275, 279 f., 291, 320
prayer, teaching on, 155 f., 222; of Jesus, lxiii, 57; Lord's Prayer, 155 f.
preface to Gospel, i, lv, 1 f.
proto-Luke, theory of, l, lviii n., lxiv, 86, 140, 262
publicans, 48, 52 f., 108, 229 f.
purpose, expressed by τοῦ c. infin., lxxxii

Quirinius, census of, 28 f., 32

relative, attraction of, lxxxii
Resurrection Appearances, lxiii f., 290 f., 314 f.
reward, idea of, 92, 190

Samaria, ministry in, 139 f., 318
Saturninus, *legatus* of Syria, 29 f.
Saviour, lxxv, 35
Semitism, lxxvi f., 148, 158, 171, 173, 175, 249. *See* Aramaism, Hebraism
seventy disciples, mission of, lxxv, 143 f.
shepherds, at the nativity, 31, 34
Simon Magus, 15, 62
Son of God, lxxiii f., 19, 20, 44, 57, 132 f., 260, 278, 288
Son of Man, lxxiv f., 79 f., 84 f., 110, 131 f., 142, 169, 171 f., 219 f., 253, 256 f., 272, 278 f.
Spirit, 15 f., 19, 40, 53, 62, 132, 172, 300 f., 318

Temple, the, at Jerusalem, 9, 12, 39, 44, 63, 153, 168, 180, 236, 242 f., 254, 275 f., 284, 302
temptations of Jesus, 61 f., 268
Tiberius, 309; accession of, 48
Transfiguration, lxxiv, 20, 132 f.

universalism, xi f., 41, 59, 66, 144, 182, 301

virgin, conception by a, 14 f., 18 f.
voices from heaven, 30 f., 57, 135

"we" passages, bearing of, on authorship of Luke-Acts, xiv f.
Wisdom of God, 167, 187

Zacchaeus, lxviii, 48, 182, 228 f., 233, 285

PRINTED BY R. & R. CLARK, LTD., EDINBURGH